The *Gnomai* of the Council of Nicaea (CC 0021)

Texts from Christian Late Antiquity

35

Series Editor

George Anton Kiraz

TeCLA (Texts from Christian Late Antiquity) is a series presenting ancient Christian texts both in their original languages and with accompanying contemporary English translations.

The *Gnomai* of the Council of Nicaea (CC 0021)

Critical text with translation, introduction and commentary

Edited and Translated by

Alistair C. Stewart

gorgias press

2015

Gorgias Press LLC, 954 River Road, Piscataway, NJ, 08854, USA

www.gorgiaspress.com

Copyright © 2015 by Gorgias Press LLC

All rights reserved under International and Pan-American Copyright Conventions. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning or otherwise without the prior written permission of Gorgias Press LLC.

2015

ISBN 978-1-4632-0260-6 **ISSN 1935-6846**

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The Gnomai of the Council of Nicea (CC 0021) : critical text with translation, introduction and commentary / edited and translated by Alistair Stewart.
pages cm. -- (Texts from Christian late antiquity, ISSN 1935-6846 ; 35)
In English and Coptic.
Includes bibliographical references and indexes.
ISBN 978-1-4632-0260-6
1. Christian life--Quotations, maxims, etc. 2. Sayings. 3. Coptic manuscripts. 4. Council of Nicaea (1st : 325 : Nicaea, Turkey) I. Stewart-Sykes, Alistair, editor, translator. II. Negnome ntsunodos etuaab. III. Negnome ntsunodos etuaab. English.
BR195.C5S748 2015
276.2'02--dc23

2015012800

Printed in the United States of America

Εὐδώρᾳ

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents vii
Preface ix
Introduction 1
The *Gnomai* of Nicaea 1
The text of the *Gnomai* 2
The date and provenance of the *Gnomai* 7
The genre of the *Gnomai* 11
The contents of the *Gnomai* 17
The purpose of the *Gnomai* 22
Conclusion 24
Sigla 25
Text and Translation 27
The Sentences (γνώμη) of the holy synod (σύνοδος) 29
Notes 87
Appendices 95
Appendix 1: Ostrakon C. 8123 96
Appendix 2: Homiletic material from Giov.AJ included by Revillout and Rossi in the *Gnomai* 98
Appendix 3: Other fragmentary material from Giov.AJ 104
a. A fragment regarding prayer and fasting (Rossi fragment 4) 104
b. A fragment regarding sorcerers (Rossi fragment 5) 106
c. A fragment regarding worshippers of Michael (unpublished) 108
Index 113
Bibliography 117

PREFACE

My interest and expertise is in the church order tradition; I first encountered this text in my work on the Two Ways Tradition, and recognized certain church order elements within it, and subsequently was led back to it through study of *Canones Hippolyti*. However well-known it may be in the circle of students of Coptic, it is all but unknown to those whose interest is in the church orders. This is my intended audience, and the main purpose of the work is less to provide a text than to provide a translation with a view to making this text better known and to advance the debate regarding church orders by allowing us to map these *Gnomai* as part of that tradition. However, I have provided a text with my discussion of the document for this audience so that, on the basis that the existing editions are hard to find and hard to use, those who have some knowledge of Coptic may be enabled to check the text if there is something of particular concern.

Although, generically, I conclude that this is a *gnomologion* rather than a church order as such, like the church orders *gnomologia* were living literature and so there are signficant divergences of content within the manuscript tradition, apart from the textual variations which are only to be expected. Thus whereas the text is based on T (see the sigla below) on the grounds that this is the most complete of the texts, and possibly the earliest, there are occasions where I have preferred a version to T, and I have translated the maximum extent of the text, noting variations of order between the MSS without determining the "original" order or content. Lammeyer (see the sigla below) has done the same very thoroughly, noting all variations between P and the other versions, but his work it is hard to use for anyone without expertise in Coptic. There are also a number of appendices, in which material from the codex containing T which at some time or other has been thought to belong to the *Gnomai* has been included.

In view of my own limitations in this regard I am so grateful to those Coptic scholars who have been patient with my trespass into their field and offered their assistance so freely and generously. In particular I must mention Carol Downer and Gesa Schenke, without whose assistance with reading and understanding the unpublished fragment this work would not have been complete, Anthony Alcock who preserved me from a number of errors, Darrell Hannah who worked with me on the fragments published by Rossi, and Tito Orlandi who shared his work with me and who also corrected me at several critical points. All have been generous with their time and expertise. I must also thank Sara Maria Demichelis of the Beni Archeologici del Piemonte and of the Museo Antichità Egizie for the provision of scans of T which have proved invaluable. Finally Melonie Schmierer-Lee of Gorgias Press has proved patient beyond all measure in seeing this work to publication.

Chalvey, Slough
On the feast of St Patrick, 2015

INTRODUCTION

THE *GNOMAI* OF NICAEA

Although known as the *Gnomai* of the Council of Nicaea, this collection has nothing to do with the Council. The name derives from their transmission alongside the Coptic collection of canonical material relating to the Council in the manuscript in which they were first identified, namely B.[1] It is in this MS that the *Gnomai* are attributed to the Council, and were so, therefore, described in their first, partial, publication in the catalogue made of the Borgian Coptic manuscripts then at Rome by Zoega.[2] Consideration of the rest of the material in this manuscript may be put aside, as may be that found in the Turin MS alongside the *Gnomai*, beyond observing that these *Gnomai* are transmitted in B alongside other material from fourth century Athanasian circles, such as the *Fides patrum*[3] and a set of canons of the Nicene council.[4] The same material is

[1] For full codicological information see the abbreviations table.

[2] Georg Zoega, *Catalogus codicum copticorum manu scriptorum qui in Museo Borgiano velitris adservantur* (Rome: Typi sacrae congregationis de propaganda fidei, 1810), 248 (Coptic), 256 (Latin.) Further material from the *Gnomai* was found elsewhere, in a MS also including the *Fides patrum* (Zoega, *Catalogus*, 239, starting on p. 575) but not identified as such by Zoega.

[3] On the *Fides patrum* see my *On the two ways: life or death, light or darkness* (Yonkers NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2011), 124–146. *Fides patrum* is the title by which this work is widely known from the Greek tradition. The Greek version was edited by Pierre Batiffol in *Didascalia CCCXVIII patrum* (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1887). Elements of the Coptic version are conserved among the Turin papyri and among the Borgian.

[4] The complete contents of the Borgian MS are given by Crum in a note to H. Achelis, "The ΓΝΩΜΑΙ of the synod of Nicaea" *JTS* 2 (1901), 121–129 at 121.See also Paola Buzi, *Catalogo dei manoscritti copti borgiani con-*

found in the collection from which T derived, though not, in the same MS, though the MS does contain some related material. Nonetheless I shall argue below that the *Gnomai* should be assigned to a similar date, and context, as the rest of this material, namely to Nicene circles in the latter part of the fourth century. As such, although the title attributing the *Gnomai* to Nicaea is misleading, their presence in the collections as presently found, and the attribution to the Council found in all witnesses, is entirely reasonable, due to the derivation of the *Gnomai* from the same fourth century Egyptian pro-Nicene circles as the rest. As already noted, in B this forms a *dossier* of material pseudonymously attributed to the council; I do not suggest, however, that the *Gnomai* were composed for such a *dossier*,[5] but that they had independent prior existence. Their attribution to Nicaea may, however precede the collection of B. The time and date of the attribution, alongside the question of the compilation of the Nicene *dossier*, may be left aside, so that the *Gnomai* may be studied in their own right.

THE TEXT OF THE *GNOMAI*

The text is extant solely in Coptic, though the probability is that the text was first composed in Greek. This may be deduced not only through the substantial Greek vocabulary[6] for, as Haase points out, this is an indication only as it is possible for Coptic literature to have used loan-words extensively and there is no point at which it is obvious that a Coptic translator has misunderstood Greek,[7] but

servati presso la Biblioteca nazionale "Vittorio Emanuele III" di Napoli (Rome: Scienze e lettere, 2009), 229. The contents of the codex are described by Tito Orlandi, "Les papyrus coptes du Musée Égyptien de Turin" *Le Muséon* 87 (1974), 115–127, at 121, and further in "The Turin Coptic papyri" *Augustinianum* (2013), 501–530 at 521. P is a fragment taken from a larger folio, the other contents of which are not known.

[5] Cf. Eugène Revillout, *Le Concile de Nicée d'après les documents coptes et les diverse collections canoniques* 2 (suite) (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1898), 491–2.

[6] So, particularly, Joseph Lammeyer, *Die sogenannte Gnomen des Concils von Nicaea: ein homiletischer Traktat des 4 Jahrhunderts* (Beirut: np, 1912), 26.

[7] Felix Haase, *Die koptischen Quellen zum Konzil von Nicäa* (*Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums* 10.4; Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1920), 111–112.

more particularly from the relatively sophisticated discussion of human freewill in the introduction which, as observed in the commentary, is an indication that the redactor was certainly a capable reader of Greek. For all the simplicity and directness of the *Gnomai*, this is not the work of a Coptic peasant.

As already noted, the *Gnomai* were first partially published by Zoega in his catalogue of Coptic manuscripts in the Borgian collection (originally from the White Monastery), though the entire text was not published until 1873, when a complete text (originally from Thinis) was discovered in Turin by Revillout.[8] Shortly afterwards Revillout published the remainder of the text partially published by Zoega, having found the rest within the Borgian collection,[9] and Rossi provided a fresh transcription of the Turin text.[10] Finally a further, incomplete, version of the *Gnomai* was published by Lammeyer from a parchment MS in Paris, dated by the editor to the twelfth century[11] and, originating, like B, from the White Monastery.[12]

[8] Eugène Revillout, *Le Concile de Nicée d'après les documents coptes: première série de documents* (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1873). Again, for complete codicological information see the sigla to the text. On the Turin collection in general see Orlandi, "Papyrus coptes."

[9] Eugène Revillout, *Le Concile de Nicée d'après les documents coptes et les diverses collections canoniques: nouvelle série de documents* (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1876), 63–72. Zoega had catalogued this material, but not identified it as being part of the Nicene collection.

[10] Francesco Rossi, *Trascizione di alcuni testi copti tratti dai papiri del Museo Egizio di Torino* 1.2 (Turin: Loescher, 1884). Rossi's transcription received a great deal of criticism from Robert Atkinson, "On Professor Rossi's publication of south-Coptic texts" *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy (1889–1901)* 3 (1893–1896), 24–99, (on the *Gnomai* 47–48) but Orlandi, "Turin Coptic papyri", 502-503, whilst critical of the arrangement of Rossi's collection, affirms that the transcription is reliable.

[11] Lammeyer, *Die sogenannte Gnomen*, here at 11–12.

[12] So Lammeyer, *Die sogenannte Gnomen*, 25.

Beyond these manuscripts there is also an ostrakon, published by Crum,[13] containing several of the sayings found in the *Gnomai*, though beyond sayings which are paralleled there are others in similar style. Furthermore the order of sayings is utterly distinct, which implies that these may have been independently transmitted, or even that this is a distinct gnomological collection. *Gnomai* were, as noted below, employed in writing exercises, and this may be the basis of the transmission of these particular *gnomai* on the ostrakon.

There is no doubt that T and B are closely related, since they are not only verbally close, but have minor points of detail in common such as peculiar orthography and distinct particles.[14] Whereas there are passages in which P is close to T and B, there are also relocations and omissions which may be observed in the apparatus to the text and translation below, as well as divergences in vocabulary, and construction. Thus at 8.12 T and B employ Greek words, presumably derived from the original, whereas P employs Coptic equivalents, while at 1.2 the converse is true, as P employs the Greek word ἀρχή where T and B have the Coptic *houeite*. On such a basis Lammeyer concludes that P, whilst deriving from the same original Coptic translation as T and B, has been transmitted entirely distinctly, and represents, moreover, a thorough revision of that original version.[15] It is hard to disagree with this conclusion. The independent transmission of the *Gnomai* indicates, moreover, that not only the original production but their translation into Coptic is entirely independent of the production of the Coptic Nicene *dossier* found in B, a *terminus ad quem* for which, as for the translation itself, is provided solely by the date of the earliest MS, which is probably B. However, since T and P at times seem to offer better readings, the date of translation has to be set back some time from the date of the MS, to allow time for the process of corruption.

---

[13] W.E. Crum, *Coptic ostraca from the collections of the Egypt Exploration Fund, the Cairo Museum and others* (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1902), #16 (p. 5).

[14] See the detailed examination of these points by Lammeyer, *Die sogenannte Gnomen*, 15–22.

[15] Lammeyer, *Die sogenannte Gnomen*, 22–3.

Moreover, in the light of the complex transmission of the material, and the existence of two distinct stemmata, it is hard to determine the extent and contents of the original. Thus, for instance, when P appears to omit material we cannot know whether this is an omission on the part of P or an expansion on the part of T and B. As will be noted below, gnomic collections were prone to expansion and alteration, a fact which is illustrated not only by the twin stemmata of the textual tradition of these *Gnomai* but by the appearance of some on an ostrakon. Thus no attempt is made to determine the "original" extent of the text, but all material is given, and when there is divergence in order between the witnesses, this is noted.

The text is based on T, which is the most complete, but all major variations are noted both in the text and in the translation.[16] For the most part it is hard to determine what is the best reading, except where there is an obvious error, such as at 6.1 where ὁμολογία is transcribed by T and B, whereas the ὁμιλία found in P is clearly correct, or at 4.13, where the error is clearly in P stating that the woman who "dwells in sin" may be known by the purity of her countenance, whereas the other versions have "hates sin."[17] For this reason extended footnotes are adopted rather than a bald apparatus.

A particular problem is posed towards the end of the text. Problems begin after 9.16 (according to the chapter and verse enumeration created for this edition) which is page 74 in the codex containing T (Giov.AJ).[18] At this point there are a number of pages in the codex which lack page numbers; unfortunately this occurs not long after the point at which B breaks off and so we are reliant solely upon T; the next numbered page which certainly belongs to the *Gnomai* is 83, which is where 13.1 picks up in this edition. Thus

---

[16] It is to be noted that Lammeyer provides a yet more detailed examination of every variation between TB and P, which is not repeated here.

[17] *esmoste m'pnobe* has been misread as *eshmoos hm' pnobe*.

[18] Giov.AJ is the designation of the codex in the *Corpus dei manoscritti Copti Letterari*, and is employed here to refer to the codex, rather than T (which is used to refer to the text of the *Gnomai*.)

eight pages (four sheets) have to be supplied. A number of pages can be ordered in accordance with sense, and on this basis chapters 10–12 are included from sheets among the Turin papyri.

After these pages Revillout supplied a further four pages here from Giov.AJ, and was followed in including these by Rossi. But these consist of self-contained homiletic material of a distinct style from the rest of the *Gnomai*. It is not impossible that a redactor did supplement the *Gnomai* by including some additional homiletic material here, and thus that Revillout was correct in including it in his edition of the *Gnomai*, but we cannot be absolutely certain of this.

Moreover there are some fragments from the codex (of which all but one sheet was published by Rossi), totalling six pages, which Orlandi suggests, should be placed within this material.[19] Generally speaking this material is all homiletic. However the lacuna, on the basis of pagination, is four pages, and so six pages (far less ten) cannot be placed within this four-page gap; thus it cannot be that all this material is derived from the *Gnomai*.

The puzzle is further complicated by the fact that one of these further pages has an extant page number, 80; one would thus expect it to provide part of the lacuna. However, the material on this page is puzzling in many ways, and hardly seems likely to be part of the *Gnomai*. Whereas it is possible that these are part of the *Gnomai*, it is also possible that the sheet is from another codex altogether,[20] or that the scribe was working from an interpolated and already confused copy.

To sum up: there are four pages missing from the pagination within the *Gnomai*. It is possible that these pages are to be found elsewhere in the codex, either in the material printed by Revillout, or in the other fragmentary material (possibly the two leaves found in the third appendix as fragments b and c.) However, if the pagination is to be trusted, there is a two-sheet gap, and there are five

[19] Orlandi, "Turin Coptic papyri", 521.

[20] Though Gesa Schenke (personal communication, March 2015) suggests that this is the work of the same scribe as the concluding part of the *Gnomai*. There is, she notes, the possibility of two scribal hands even within the *Gnomai*. This does not make the task of determining the solution to the puzzle any easier.

sheets which are candidates for placement within this two-sheet gap, of which none is an obvious fit, even though one bears a page number which belongs in the sequence of missing pages. Given the uncertainty over all this, none of the material is printed in the main edition, but all is supplied in appendices, both in Coptic and in English.

My own belief is that the scribe was working from a confused copy and copied fragment c and another page in the belief that they were part of the *Gnomai*, that the pages included by Revillout are simply freestanding homilies, and that nothing is missing from the original *Gnomai*. However, it is also possible that material extending to four pages (two sheets) are missing from the text (after 12.4 in this edition), or indeed that either the material included by Revillout, or some of the other fragmentary material (including that bearing the page number), should fill the lacuna. The final arbiter of this matter must be the reader. My aim has been simply to provide all the evidence.

THE DATE AND PROVENANCE OF THE *GNOMAI*

Given that the *Gnomai*, like the church order literature to which we will observe that this document is related, may well contain traditional material, thus preserving within itself sources earlier than its final redaction, dating is complex. However, the section on Trinitarian doctrine with which the *Gnomai* begin provides a convenient point with which to consider the question. This introduction is firmly anti-Arian (there is no κτίσμα in the Trinity, it is stated) and the divinity of the Son is clearly upheld.[21] However, the status of the Spirit is less clear; there is no explicit statement of the Spirit's divinity as such, and no statement that the Spirit has any role in creation, but rather the Spirit gives growth to creatures.[22] As such we may date this to a period prior to that in which the equal divinity of the Spirit was widely recognized in Nicene circles, on which basis the redaction of the *Gnomai* is unlikely to have taken place

[21] *Gnomai* 1.2.
[22] *Gnomai* 1.10.

later than 370.[23] Of course, this may be just a source, but it is more probable that this introduction was composed by the redactor of the *Gnomai* in order to set out the doctrine of freewill by which the readers might make moral progress through following the teaching which is set out. The direct polemic against Arianism, as indeed the absence of any recognition of persecution, points to a *terminus a quo* of 325. The emphasis on *monachai*, with the implication, explored below, that these *monachai* are urban ascetics rather than organized in monastic houses, is a further indication of a fourth-century date. It has been argued that Ambrose had read the *Gnomai* as he has reference to the frequent angelic visitations which Our Lady received, a statement otherwise paralleled only in a Marian homiletic section embedded in the *Gnomai*,[24] which if true would again give a secure dating to the *Gnomai* in the fourth century, although it is also possible that Ambrose simply had access to the tradition to which allusion is made.[25] However, the very parallelism, as indeed the parallelism of tone, if not of actual content, between this section and the section on Mary found in Athanasius' *Ep 1 ad virg.*, again tends to point to a fourth-century date. Finally, whereas Achelis suggests that references to vigils imply a fifth century date,[26] again we may respond that a date in the second half of the fourth century is entirely feasible, since Egeria at that same time describes an elaborate system of vigils in Jerusalem,[27] and Athanasius mentions the practice at Alexandria.[28] We may therefore suggest that these *Gnomai* derive from the middle of the fourth century and, given the denial of the central tenets of Arianism within the opening, that they derive from Nicene circles.[29]

---

[23] My thanks are due to Mark DelCogliano (personal communication, June 2013) for this observation.

[24] By Neil Adkin, "Ambrose *De virginibus* 2.2.10f and the *Gnomes of the council of Nicaea*" *REA* 38 (1992), 261–270.

[25] Thus the *Historia de Nativitate Mariae* 9 states that Mary was familiar with angelic visitations (though this is a rather later work.)

[26] Achelis, "**ΓΝΩΜΑΙ**", 127.

[27] *Iter.* 27.7, 29.1–3.

[28] *De fuga* 24.

[29] Lammeyer, *Die sogenannte Gnomen*, 27, likewise suggests a fourth century date on the basis of the engagement with Arianism, a dispute

We should not, however, suppose Athanasian authorship.[30] This question is explored by Brakke, who concludes that such authorship is unlikely. In particular he compares the portraits of the Virgin Mary found in 6.1 and that of Athanasius' *Ep. 1 ad virg.*[31] Thus whereas both hold up Mary as the model for a consecrated virgin, Brakke suggests that this is simply a commonplace. Similarly in both Mary is chosen by Christ (described within the *Gnomai* as "the Lord", by Athanasius as "the Word"), but Brakke points out that there is particular Athanasian language at this point within Athanasius' letter which is absent from the *Gnomai*. Again, both suggest that Mary was disturbed by the voice of Gabriel, as she was unfamiliar with strange men, but once again the description given by Athanasius is far more detailed. Both describe Mary as eating only as much as is necessary to avoid death, but whereas Athanasius is clear that this was for the sake of the body the *Gnomai* explicitly state that she ate not for the body. The same is true in the discussion of sleeping, for whereas Athanasius states that she gave rest to her body the *Gnomai* state that the slept only out of necessity, and not to give rest to the body. Finally Brakke notes that parallels regarding Mary's life at home, and Mary's life of prayer, are very inexact. He suggests that both draw on ideas common with fourth-century Egypt, but is equally clear that this common ground in no way indicates common authorship. However, in agreeing with Brakke regarding authorship, we should note the more important point that the two breathe a common air and are at home in a common ascetic context. In this light we may also note Haase's observation of a degree of common ground between these *Gnomai*

---

which, he suggests, is no longer current in Egypt beyond the fourth century.

[30] Already denied by Achelis, "ΓΝΩΜΑΙ", 129, though suggested by as possible by Y.-M. Duval, "La problématique de la 'Lettre aux vierges' d'Athanase" *Le Muséon,* 88 (1975), 405–433 at 415–16, n. 44, and Revillout, *Concile de Nicée* (suite), 491. Although it may be possible to read the heading of T as an ascription to Athanasius, this, as observed in the notes to the translation, is unlikely.

[31] David Brakke, "The Authenticity of the Ascetic Athanasius" *Orientalia* 63 (1994), 17–56 at 50–56.

and the *Sententiae* of Evagrius Ponticus, though he does not go so far as to suggest common authorship.[32]

To an extent in what precedes an Egyptian provenance is assumed. Such is suggested by Lammeyer, on the basis of the transmission in Coptic and the interest in Nicaea apparent in the material alongside which it is transmitted in B, namely the reports of the Council and the *Fides patrum*,[33] the latter of which is almost certainly of Egyptian origin. The discussion of the conduct of consecrated virgins is also coherent with such a place of origin. Finally we will note many points of contact with *Canones Hippolyti*, again an assuredly Egyptian work,[34] which suggest that the two documents originated from a similar social and religious context.

A separate question is that of the formation of the Nicene *dossier* of which the *Gnomai* are part, alongside *Fides patrum* and the Coptic canons of the Council. We may only guess at this, though we may reject the suggestion of Revillout that this is the work of Athanasius in the wake of the Council of Alexandria[35] simply on the basis of the dating which I have essayed elsewhere for the *Fides patrum*, which may be dated with a fair degree of confidence to the last years of the fourth century,[36] and therefore postdates Athanasius' activity. Otherwise all we may say is that the *dossier* is the result of scribal activity in the fifth century, or later. Haase suggests that the rationale for the inclusion of the *Gnomai* in this *dossier* was that of making good what might be seen as a defect.[37] That is to say, the ethical section of *Fides patrum* starts out by stating that it is to describe the way of life for monks and for all Christians, cleric and lay. However, what follows is chiefly aimed at the monks; Haase thus suggests that the *Gnomai* are included, following on from the *Fides patrum*, to address the needs of the lay audience, since it is to

---

[32] Haase, *Die koptischen Quellen*, 112. Parallels between various of the *Gnomai* and Evagrius' *Sententiae* are observed in the annotation.

[33] Lammeyer, *Die sogenannte Gnomen*, 25–7.

[34] Thus see Heinzgard Brakmann, 'Alexandreia und die Kanones des Hippolyt' *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 22, (1979), 139–149, and refs.

[35] Revillout, *Concile de Nicée* (suite), 491–2.

[36] So my *On the two ways*, 129–131.

[37] Haase, *Die koptischen Quellen*, 112.

laity that the *Gnomai* are chiefly addressed. However, the *Gnomai* themselves, at least to some extent, address ascetics, in particular female ascetics, and so it does not seem that they were composed for the purpose of supplementing the *Fides patrum*; although they may have been included in the Nicene *dossier* for the reasons which Haase suggests, it was hardly a successful strategy. It seems more probable that the collection was made after the *Gnomai* had been attributed to the Council, and that the construction of the *dossier* was a scribal effort along the lines of the construction of the Clementine Octateuch out of pre-existing church-order material. The "Nicenization" of the *Gnomai* may have come about through the strongly Nicene doctrinal introduction, and it may simply be on the basis of this attribution that the material is bound up to the conciliar material and to the *Fides patrum*. Nonetheless, as T and P would indicate, the *Gnomai* continued to circulate independently of their inclusion in the Nicene *dossier*, as well as within it.

THE GENRE OF THE *GNOMAI*

Achelis had no difficulty in classifying the *Gnomai*: "It is a 'Church Order', written by an as yet unidentified author for a particular community."[38] However, as Achelis goes on to note, there are significant differences between this and "other works of the same class." Thus he notes the absence of any material regarding ordinations or the liturgy, in other words the very subjects which define the "church order" element in the church order literature. It is the very diversity of the nature of the material found within the church orders which has led to the questioning of the legitimacy of the classification of church orders as a genre.[39] However, although it is hard, therefore, to classify the *Gnomai* as such due the absence of any "church order" material,[40] we may note the links with material in the acknowledged church orders; thus 9.1 reflects Didache 3.2 and parallels, and the discussion of male coiffure reflects a similar

[38] Achelis, "**ΓΝΩΜΑΙ**", 123.

[39] By, e.g., Joseph G. Mueller, "The ancient church order literature: genre or tradition" *JECS* 15 (2007), 337–380.

[40] So likewise Lammeyer, *Die sogenannte Gnomen*, 29.

treatment at *Didascalia apostolorum* 1.3.10 and parallels, the same passage of the *Didascalia* similarly warning men against female wiles.[41]

Also noteworthy in this connection is the attribution of the *Gnomai* to Hippolytus in the heading of P. Whereas this is an obviously fictitious attribution, it is interesting as an indication of the extent to which the name of Hippolytus had become a cipher for tradition. [42] There may, however, be yet more to this, as it may indicate an association with the *Canones Hippolyti* which originated in fourth century Egypt and which certainly continued to circulate in that locale, and which derived from the (arguably authentically) Hippolytean *Traditio apostolica*. There are several points of contact between *Canones Hippolyti* and the *Gnomai*.[43] Thus the *gnomai* which prohibit a woman from wearing jewellery in church (e.g. 4.3) may be compared to *Canones Hippolyti* 17, which likewise prohibits such a thing. The same canon forbids women from wearing wavy hair or fringes, in the same way that this is condemned within the *Gnomai*. Similarly the statements that virgins should read on awaking (6.5) may be paralleled by the instruction that one is to take up a book and read when there is no service in church (*Canones Hippolyti* 27), though this has further echoes within the church order literature, particularly within *Traditio apostolica*. The characterization of an adulterer in the *Gnomai* as an infanticide (7.1) is comparable to the description in *Canones Hippolyti* 16 of a man who marries another other than his concubine (especially if the concubine has a child by him) as a murderer. Some relationship does seem plausible here, as the *gnomē* seems to have lost the sense of why such a one might be described as an infanticide. The *gnomai* which state that any who is

---

[41] Haase, *Die koptischen Quellen*, 101, 108, likewise notes the echoes of the Didache and Didascalia, whilst dismissing any direct literary relationship.

[42] Thus Christoph Markschies, "Wer schrieb die sogenannte *Traditio apostolica*? Neue Boebachtungen und Hypothesen zu einer kaum lösbaren Frage aus der altkirchlichen Literaturegeschichte" in Wolfram Kinzig, Christoph Markschies, Markus Vinzent (edd) *Tauffragen und Bekenntnis* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), 10, 42, speaks of the Hippolytization of tradition.

[43] Particularly observed by René-Georges Coquin, *Les canons d'Hippolyte* (PO 31.2; Paris, Firmin-Didot, 1966), 48.

late without good cause lacks any blessing (8.13–14) may be compared to the direction at *Canones Hippolyti* 21 that a latecomer is to be excluded. Finally Coquin compares the direction to offer firstfruits at *Canones Hippolyti* 32 to a like direction in the *Gnomai*. However, this is ultimately a direction derived from *Traditio apostolica*, at least within the context of *Canones Hippolyti*, though it is also a directive found elsewhere. In conclusion we may note the common direction that virgins are to fast frequently (*Gnomai* 6.2, 14 cf. *Canones Hippolyti* 32), and the statement that young women should wear a thick veil to church (*Gnomai* 4.16 cf. *Canones Hippolyti* 18), but again point out that these are far from being unique parallels. Coquin concludes that it is difficult to determine a direct dependence of the *Gnomai* on the *Canones Hippolyti*, but that the two reflect the same ecclesiastical background and possibly the same period in the religious situation which they suppose, in the moral and disciplinary tendencies which they represent. We may concur. However, the appearance of the name of Hippolytus may nonetheless indicate an awareness of *Canones Hippolyti* on the part of the scribe of P, and implies that the *Gnomai* were recognized as in some way tied up with the church order tradition.

However, in spite of the literary links to the church order tradition, this does not provide a generic classification of the *Gnomai*. Lammeyer suggests instead that the document should be considered a "homiletic tractate", produced by a learned cleric (he notes the extensive acquaintance with Scripture on the part of the author) for the guidance of the laity.[44] However, Lammeyer was in part, we may suggest, responding to the homiletic section which, as discussed above, is probably to be removed from the *Gnomai*; the document is made up of brief and unconnected exhortations which, whilst they may concern the same subjects as homilies, are formally distinct.

The brevity and unconnectedness of so much of the material leads us to suggest that, rather than as a "church order" or a "homiletic tractate" we would better classify the *Gnomai* precisely as their title would indicate; this is a gnomic anthology. Whereas *gnomai*, defined following Hermogenes as "a summary statement, in

[44] *Die sogenannte Gnomen*, 29–31.

universal terms, dissuading or exhorting in regard to something, or making clear what a particular thing is",[45] appear embedded in literary contexts as far back as Homer, the collection of *gnomai* into anthologies begins in the Hellenistic world.[46]

Although there may be literary productions, in which *gnomai* preponderate, such as the *Ad Demonicum* of ps-Isocrates, or indeed the Didache, in particular in the Two Ways section, these may be distinguished as wisdom literature with specific and direct educational purposes.[47] This, however, is a collection without apparent order or system. Among classical examples of such anthologies we may observe the *Kuriai doxai* of Epicurus and the *Sententiae* of Publilius Syrus. The form was moreover adopted within Hellenistic Jewish circles, as the existence of the *Sententiae* of ps-Phocylides indicates, and that such collections were made and employed by Christians may readily be illustrated by pointing to the *Sententiae Sexti*. In the same manner, short *gnomai* are strung together without any obvious thematic coherence; within this collection we may observe the use of catchwords and linkwords; as Wilson points out,[48] these were common means of organizing gnomic collections in classical antiquity:

> A wise *monachē* does not speak to men at all; the **senseless** sports with the young.
>
> Just as **senseless** men give the honourable name of God to idols, so they give the name of virgin to senseless women likewise. For the name of **virginity** is a name of divinity.

---

[45] Hermogenes *Progymnasmata* 4. We do not concern ourselves here, as does Teresa Morgan, *Popular morality in the early Roman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 84–5, with the fine distinction between *gnome* and proverb.

[46] So Teresa Morgan, *Literate education in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 121.

[47] So W.T. Wilson, *The Mysteries of Righteousness: the Literary Composition and Genre of the Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1994), 39–41.

[48] Wilson, *Mysteries of righteousness*, 30–31.

> No **virgin** *monachē* would look upon **gold** or pearls; what she possesses is better than both of these.
>
> Like somebody who chooses **gold** from among material things, so is someone who chooses **virginity** from among the virtues … (6.8–11)

The string of *gnomai* is however interrupted through the intrusion of material which appears homiletic, most notably the extended discussion of the Virgin Mary, upheld as a model for Christian virgins to follow. Although this passage of extended prose interrupts the string of *gnomai* it nonetheless fits well in the scheme of the work; as already noted, in spirit, if not in detail, it may readily be compared to Athanasius *Ep. 1 ad virg.* similarly putting forward Mary as a model for Christian virgins,[49] and is thus entirely at home in a fourth-century context. The contemporaneity of this passage with the main body of the *Gnomai*, the manner in which the concerns of the Marian section mirror those of the *gnomai* for the conduct of virgins in general, and the manner in which this section fits its context, all indicate that, rather than being a secondary addition, this section should be seen as a redactional insertion of homiletic material and attributed to the main level of redaction rather than to a later interpolator.

We may turn again, in this context, to the homiletic material which, as discussed above, has been excised from the *Gnomai*. If the codicological argument is put aside then it might be suggested that the presence of an extended piece of prose is reminiscent of the manner in which a homiletic passage is inserted into church order material in the *Canones Hippolyti*, providing the climax to the rewritten church order. Formally we may also note that Evagrius' sentences conclude with a passage of extended prose. Herein, however, is found a doctrinal summary, of the kind found here, and in

---

[49] Brakke "Authenticity". Lammeyer compares the *Historia de Nativitate*, but as suggested above this is generally considered a much later work, though derived from the *Protoevangelium Jacobi*. See on this J. Gijsel and R. Beyers *Libri de nativitate Mariae* (2 vols. CCSA 9–10; Turnhout: Brepols, 1997), 59–67.

Canones Hippolyti, at the beginning, rather than a homiletic addendum or summary.

The *Gnomai*, however, need no summary conclusion, as a concluding catena of texts, themselves gnomic in form, following on from a set of *gnomai* which summarize much of what had preceded, and giving particular emphasis to concern for the poor and for the worship of God, create an artful conclusion.

This conclusion, moreover, gives us an indication of the audience for the *Gnomai*; that is to say that they are largely addressed to a wealthy elite, directing them, as part of their ethical formation as Christians, to have concern for the poor.

The moral discourse is preceded by a doctrinal exposition; this the *Gnomai* have in common with the *Canones Hippolyti*, and (also from the fourth century) *Fides patrum*, as well as the *Canones Basilii*. In the *Canones Hippolyti* and the *Fides patrum* the profession of a Trinitarian faith is connected to Christian conduct; the link between faith and life is less clear here, but the section nonetheless provides a coherent introduction to what is an ethical discourse through the enunciation of a doctrine of free-will and of moral autonomy (*autexousia*), the implications of which being that as behaviour is being regulated in what follows so the reader might not claim any deterministic principle as a reason for not observing the moral demands which follow. Here, as is noted in the commentary, the language of stoicism is being pressed into service, though the source may well be Clement or Origen; however, insofar as much of the material within the *Gnomai* may have been traditional, this would appear to be an introduction composed to head the collection as a discourse.

We may thus conclude that this is a *gnomologion*, aimed at the ethical direction of its wealthy audience. What is interesting is that this gnomological form, here containing ascetic precepts, is subsequently taken up in ascetic discourse, for instance by Evagrius and by Stephen of Thebes in his *Sermo asceticus*, and employed for the induction of new ascetics. As such the function of *gnomologia* in the classical world as works of training is continued in the ascetic tradition within Egypt; it is likely that these Nicene *Gnomai* are the first example of such a phenomenon. However, we will attend more closely to the precise purpose of their redaction after a consideration of the contents.

THE CONTENTS OF THE *GNOMAI*

In her discussion of Graeco-Roman *gnomologia* Morgan picks on wealth and its use, social relations between rich and poor and the conduct of the wise (and conversely, the foolish) as being the major *topoi* addressed in gnomic anthologies. We may also note, with her, that the subject of marital and family relations, and warnings against prostitutes, are found within gnomic collections.[50]

To an extent the Nicene *Gnomai* deal with similar subjects. Thus *gnomai* deal with the concern the rich should have for the poor, the wise and the foolish, the manner in which men should raise their sons and daughters, the dangers of prostitutes. Beyond these, however, there are a number of subjects given extensive treatment which are not found in the run of classical anthologies; in particular we may note the extensive treatment of the conduct of virgins and the discussions of behaviour in church (including, we may note, some revealing passages regarding the reception of Communion, clearly a matter of concern for the gnomologist.) We may also note that the discussion of wisdom and foolishness is largely concerned with wise and foolish women, as much as with men. Thus the absence from classical *gnomologia* of subjects on which this particular collection concentrates, namely the conduct of wealthy women (even if addressed to men, in order that they may control the behaviour of their wives and daughters) and conversely that of female ascetics (it may be noted that the first *gnomē* concerning this is addressed to a potential virgin's father, presumably to dissuade him for seeking a husband for her), as well as behaviour in church more generally, indicates that these are specific to the concerns of the gnomologist and the community which he addresses. Thus whereas some occasional warnings within the *Gnomai* may simply reflect literary convention rather than social reality, the extensive concentration within the *Gnomai* on the conduct of *monachai,* not notable for its appearance in classical collections, indicates that this is certainly part of the gnomologist's social world and a significant point of emphasis in his purpose.

---

[50] See, in summary, her diagram in *Popular morality*, 121.

The virgins whose lifestyle and occupations are described are individual urban ascetics, rather than those living in community. Thus they are in a position to store up wealth, and to promenade in the mid-day (activities denied them by the *Gnomai*). As such, the independence of these virgins is consonant with an Egyptian origin. The designation *monachē* is found in papyri,[51] in which we find these *monachai* engaging in business and lawsuits independently, an indication that these *monachai* are dedicated virgins living in their own houses, but also that the gnomic warnings against *monachai* storing up wealth are not altogether empty, given that these *monachai* are owners of property.

A significant emphasis within the direction to virgins lies in the intellectual activities of these virgins. From within a (probably) Cappadocian setting the *Discourse on salvation* suggests that the word of God should not be far from the virgin's mouth, and that she should learn the psalms, "the book should be in her hand at the first hour", and set hours are given for prayer.[52] Perhaps more pertinent is the fourth *sentence* of Evagrius Ponticus: "Let the rising sun see the book in your hands, and after the second hour your work." Similarly in the *Gnomai* there is insistence on the virgin's reading: "the first two hours are set aside for reading, as is the time from the ninth hour on."[53] Although there are directions within the church orders stating that the early hours of the day should be taken up with reading, the directions of the gnomologist, as of Evagrius, are specifically addressed to virgins. The *Gnomai* would thus seem to share a social climate with the Athanasian ascetic literature addressed to virgins, insofar as it sets up an intellectual ascetic core of women who read, but who do not associate or discuss

---

[51] E.g. PSI 6.698 (Oxyrhynchus, 392), P.Oxy 66.3862 (fourth–fifth century), P.Oxy 44.3205 (400) (in which the *monachai* in question are explicitly described as *apotaktikai*, indicating that they are independent, and not members of a cenobitic community) and P.Lond. 5 1731 (Syene, 585.) The latter two are found translated in Jane Rowlandson (ed.), *Women and society in Greek and Roman Egypt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 79–80.

[52] *De virg.* 12.

[53] *Gnomai* 6.5.

with men. Brakke suggests that the restrictions on virgins' associations proposed by Athanasius are intended to distinguish the virgins of the Athanasian school from those who, in the study circles typical of the scholasticized Christianity widespread in Alexandria, were drawn into Arian circles.[54]

It might be argued that Brakke has overemphasized the distinction between church and study-circle in the fourth century, in that in taking over the independent schools the church also takes on a number of their concerns and characteristics; it must not be forgotten that Arius who, as Brakke rightly points out, succeeds to the concerns and methods of the Alexandrian school tradition, was originally at least a presbyter of Alexandria in communion with his bishop. However, in comparison to the emphasis on reading found in the *Gnomai* there is relatively little of this within the Athanasian ascetic material; we may also note that, by contrast to Evagrius, the *Gnomai* set aside two hours for reading in the morning, and also expect reading in the evening. As such, given the limited evidence provided by the *Gnomai*, it is possible that these present an Arian as much as an Athanasian intellectual concern in directing learning within the church. However, what is significant is the direction that the virgin should not speak to men at all since as such she is prevented from participation in discussion. Insofar as the *Gnomai* instruct an intellectual cadre of virgins, they are clearly Nicene for, apart from the theological introduction, the inclusion of the Marian homiletic fragment does not simply set up Mary as a model for virgins in prayer and solitude, but is also distinctly anti-Arian, in that Christ, described as "Lord", makes the choice of Mary to be his own mother. However, it is also to be noted that apart from reflecting an Athanasian concern for the submission of virgins, the

[54] David Brakke, *Athanasius and asceticism* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 57–79. On competing schools within Alexandria which might find support among female ascetics, even beyond the Athanasian and the Arian, see also Stephen J. Davis, *The cult of St Thecla: a tradition of women's piety in late antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 95–103 and, on the role of virgins within the Arian controversy generally, Susanna Elm, *'Virgins of God'. The Making of Asceticism in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 331–372.

Gnomai share a social and intellectual world with Egyptian Arianism; the nature of the conflict is that the parties are struggling to occupy the same social space. The gnomologist's concern for correct intellectual engagement through scripture, and through the church (as opposed to quasi-independent schools and teachers), is not restricted to virgins, as those who work are directed to attend daily at the church to hear the reading,[55] and elsewhere within the *Gnomai* there is emphasis on hearing the readings of the liturgy.[56] As such the *Gnomai* perhaps mirror a more "traditional" Alexandrian concern for learning than Athanasius himself, even whilst being aligned with the Nicene party. Such a scholastic background is indicated not simply by the content and the vocabulary,[57] but by the very choice of the gnomological form.

Beyond the concentration on *monachai*, *gnomai* are addressed variously to men and to married women, which is reminiscent of the manner in which early Christian *paraenesis* is addressed similarly to distinct groupings. The earliest *Sitz im Leben* for which it is possible to determine this paraenetic content is catechetical, though reminders of such catechesis might in turn be given to the baptized in order to call them back to the lessons learnt in catechesis, or to establish a common ground; there is no question that the *Gnomai* are addressed to the baptized. Thus, to allude again to the links between the *Didascalia* and the *gnomai* addressed to men on beards, as on women, we may note that this section of the *Didascalia* would seem to reflect a wider pattern of catechetical discourse such as that found in Clement (at, e.g. *Paed.* 2.8, 2.10 and 3.3.) As such is not properly part of the church order tradition, but rather is the result of confluence between the tradition and streams of catechetical tradition, one of which streams is represented by the *Gnomai*. Such a tradition is also found in the, yet later, pseudonymous canons, which properly seem to be the continuation of the church order tradition; thus, for instance, in seeking to regulate the dress and

[55] 2.3–4.

[56] 8.11.

[57] The use of conventional Greek philosophical vocabulary within the introductory passage is observed in the annotation.

toilette of married women, likewise, the *Gnomai* are especially close to *Canones Basilii* 26.

Perhaps as a result of the subject matter with which the *Gnomai* are concerned, possibly because of the manner in which they have been constructed from pre-formed units of catechetical tradition, we may contrast these *Gnomai* to other examples of the genre by observing the very practical nature of their dictates; although there are some expressions of general principle, such as "Whoever goes on the path of sin, contrary to nature, is a brother of anyone who hates",[58] the overall effect of the arrangement of the *Gnomai* and the manner in which they are addressed to particular groups give the impression of practical wisdom, rather than the universal ethical principles which are the concern of Sextus. It is perhaps this, rather than the homiletic content which has been brought into the *Gnomai*, which led Lammeyer to describe the *Gnomai* as homiletic.

Finally we may note the conclusion, made up of *gnomai* mined from the Gospels to create a catena of texts (one of which has already been employed) to form an appropriate conclusion to the collection, summing up the fundamental purpose of the production of the *gnomologion*:

> On this account, my beloved, as we know what the will of God is with regard to mercy, let us love mercy. It is said that compassion is more highly exalted than judgement. For, he says, "Blessed are the compassionate, compassion will be shown to them." The Lord Jesus said: "Be merciful, because your Father is merciful. Do not judge so that you be not judged. Do not condemn, that you be not condemned. Forgive, and you will be forgiven. Give, and it will be given to you. A measure, goodly, plentiful, pressed down, overflowing, will be poured into your lap. For with the measure with which you measure, will it be measured for yourselves."

Ultimately it is the duty of a wealthy Christian, or of an ascetic with surplus production, to give to the poor.

---

[58] *Gnomai* 9.2.

THE PURPOSE OF THE *GNOMAI*

In identifying the *Gnomai* as a *gnomologion* like those known elsewhere in Christian and in classical culture, we may suggest that its purpose is likely to be the same as that which might be divined for other instances of the same phenomenon. The purpose of such anthologies would in the first instance appear to have been educational, as a means of providing instruction in a readily digestible package,[59] as well as being useful as writing exercises.[60] However, even if the collection of *gnomai* in anthologies originated in the schoolroom, we cannot be sure that this is the continued use to which they were put once established as a literary form. A schoolroom use does not appear immediately to have been the use of the *Sententiae Sexti*, any more than for the Nicene *Gnomai*; thus whereas Lazaridis suggests that the original context for the production and transmission of these anthologies beyond the schoolroom is largely unknown,[61] we should note Galen's report of a reflective reading of the *sentences* of Pythagoras: "You may be sure that I have grown accustomed to ponder twice a day the exhortations attributed to Pythagoras—first I read them over, then I recite them aloud." This is in the context of learning self-control, as Galen suggests that the exercise of self-examination is appropriately undertaken at the beginning of the day and at its close.[62] This is interesting in itself, in that it reflects the suggestion of hearing the word at the beginning of the day found within the *Gnomai*. A similar understanding of the purpose of a *gnomologion* is exhibited in Rufinus' preface to his version of the *Sententiae Sexti*, in which he states that he had picked

---

[59] Morgan, *Literate education*, 121; Wilson, *Mysteries of righteousness*, 32–3, and references.

[60] As has already been suggested, it is perhaps as a writing exercise that we have the preservation of *gnomai* in C. P.Bour 1 provides a further example of *gnomai* being set as a writing exercise.

[61] Nikolaos Lazaridis *Wisdom in Loose Form. The Language of Egyptian and Greek Proverbs in Collections of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 42.

[62] Galen *De Propriorum Animi Cuiuslibet Affectuum Dignotione et Curatione* 6. Here, interestingly, he also quotes from the *Carmen aureum*, the very gnomic collection to which he is possibly referring.

this work because of its brevity, simplicity and ease of reading which, nonetheless, conveyed significant wisdom in a slight compass, wisdom which, through repeated reading, might bring about instruction and conversion of life in the heart of the reader. Finally we may note ps-Diogenianus' prologue to his collection, in which he states that collections of this nature are a means of popularizing the sayings of the wise, again mentioning Pythagoras. Thus Morgan suggests that the employment of *gnomologia* went beyond the schoolroom, pointing out that gnomic anthologies were among the most widely read material in antiquity;[63] whereas this may in part be due to the role they played in education she suggests further that the extensive quotation of well-known *gnomai* they cause them to filter through to a non-literate population.[64] Thus she argues that miscellanies, including gnomic miscellanies, were read seriatim, and were re-read and memorized as part of classical intellectual formation.[65] In this light, similar conclusions may be drawn from the comments of Plutarch to Eurydice in giving advice to her on marriage and living a philosophical life in which he suggests that she should be familiar with the sayings of the wise and good (τοῖς τῶν σοφῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν ἀποφθέγμασιν)[66] and Seneca's comment that he attempts daily to remember one philosophical thought as a result of re-reading familiar material.[67]

All this would indicate that the Nicene *Gnomai*, like other *gnomologia*, is a literary production for private reading, and that like its classical parallels it is intended to form its readers through the inculcation of pithy and memorable statements. We have already noted that the gnomic collection has been supplemented through homiletic material; significantly the final homiletic section is partic-

---

[63] Morgan, *Popular morality*, 90.

[64] Morgan, *Popular morality*, 90.

[65] Morgan, *Popular morality*, 257–273. Similar points are made by Wilson, *Mysteries of righteousness*, 32–33.

[66] *Coniugalia praecepta* 145b–146.

[67] Seneca *Ep.* 2.5–6, observed by Robert L. Wilken, "Wisdom and philosophy in early Christianity" in R.L. Wilken (ed.), *Aspects of wisdom in Judaism and early Christianity* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975), 143–168, here at 164.

ularly addressed to the wealthy, who in turn are more likely to be literate and thus to be users of such a manual. As such it would seem that the redactor has employed a largely traditional set of *gnomai* in order to lend the strength of acknowledged wisdom to his own insights, and to direct this in particular to the wealthy within the community, to encourage them to righteous lives and to the support of the poor. The *gnomai* aimed at female ascetics are also included since this group is also likely to be literate. The *Gnomai* were thus produced for the formation of literate, and well-off, Egyptian Christians, to be digested by repeated reading, the presence of traditional material lending authority to the insights of the redactor.

CONCLUSION

Beyond its interest as a literary phenomenon, perhaps the most interesting aspect of the *Gnomai* is as rich evidence for the social history of fourth-century Egyptian Christianity. Recent studies have charted the rapid growth of Christianity within Egypt during that century;[68] the *Gnomai* provide essential evidence of the nature of that Christianization. Achelis describes the *Gnomai* as indicative of a generation of Christianity in which love had grown cold;[69] it is possible that they describe, rather, a Christianity which had yet to become rooted in the hearts of those who espoused it.

[68] Notably by Roger S. Bagnall, "Religious conversion and onomastic change in early Byzantine Egypt" *BASP* 19 (1982), 105–24 now supported by M. Depauw and W. Clarysse, "How Christian was Fourth Century Egypt? Onomastic Perspectives on Conversion" *Vigiliae Christianae* 67 (2013), 407–435.

[69] Achelis, "ΓΝΩΜΑΙ", 123.

SIGLA

B: Borgia collection, from the White monastery (IB.10.10–27). Zoega CLIX, 73–84, Buzi, 228–230, now in the Museo archeologico nazionale di Napoli. Published by Eugène Revillout, *Le Concile de Nicée d'après les textes Coptes: nouvelle série de documents* (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1876). According to W.E. Crum (in an additional note to H. Achelis, "The ΓΝΩΜΑΙ of the synod of Nicaea" *JTS* 2 (1901), 121–129, at 122), this MS may be dated on the basis of the colophon to 677.

C: Ostrakon C. 8123. Ed. W.E. Crum, Coptic ostraca from the collections of the Egypt Exploration Fund, the Cairo Museum and others (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1902), #16 (p. 5).

Lammeyer: v. sub P.

P: Bibliotheque nationale Copte-sahidique 129 14/75–82. Edited by Joseph Lammeyer, *Die sogenannte Gnomen des Concils von Nicaea: ein homiletischer Traktat des 4 Jahrhunderts* (Beirut: np, 1912). Lammeyer (11–12) dates this parchment folio of 8 leaves to the 11th or 12th century.

Revillout: v. sub T.

Rossi: v sub T.

T: Museo Egizio di Torino, cat. 63000 codex 7a (Giov. AJ), glasses 22v–32, (originally from the church of John the Baptist in Thinis). Edited by Eugène Revillout, *Le Concile de Nicée d'après les textes Coptes: première série de documents* (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1873) and again by Francesco Rossi, *Trascizione di alcuni testi copti tratti dai papiri del Museo Egizio di Torino* 1.2 (Turin: Loescher, 1884). A date in the seventh or eighth century is suggested by Orlandi (personal communication, February 2013.)

TEXT AND TRANSLATION

ⲛⲉⲅⲛⲱⲙⲏ ⲛ̄ⲧⲥⲩⲛⲟⲇⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ[1]

1.1: ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲟⲩⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲥ ⲡⲉ. ⲡ$\overline{\text{ⲭⲥ}}$ ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲡⲉ[2] ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ. ⲟⲩⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲥ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲉⲡ$\overline{\text{ⲛⲁ}}$ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ.

1.2: ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲧⲟ̄ ⲣⲟⲩⲉⲓⲧⲉ.[3] ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲣⲁⲛ ⲱⲟⲟⲡ ⲛ̄ⲧⲛ̄ⲛⲧⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲩ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲡⲉ ⲧⲁⲣⲭⲏ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲭⲱⲕ ⲛ̄ⲡⲧⲏⲣⲟ̄. ⲙⲛ̄ⲕⲧⲓⲥⲙⲁ ⲱⲟⲟⲡ ⲉ̄ⲛ ⲧⲉⲧⲣⲓⲁⲥ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲩ ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲁⲩⲥⲱⲛ̄ⲧ ⲛ̄ⲡⲧⲏⲣⲟ̄.

1.3: ⲙ̄ⲙ̄ⲛ ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲛ̄ⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲉⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲣⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲩⲣⲃⲏⲩⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ.[4]

1.4: ⲁⲩⲧ ⲟⲩⲁⲩⲇⲟⲍⲟⲩⲥⲓⲟⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧ ⲣⲙ̄ⲡⲧⲏⲣⲟ̄ ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ ⲉⲣⲉ ⲛⲉⲓⲡⲣⲟⲫⲁⲓⲣⲏⲥⲓⲥ ⲟⲩⲱⲛⲉ̄ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ.[5]

1.5: ⲁ ⲧⲉⲡⲣⲟⲫⲁⲓⲣⲏⲥⲓⲥ ⲇⲉ[6] ⲛ̄ⲣⲟⲓⲛⲉ ⲑⲙⲥⲟⲟⲩ ⲫⲁⲧⲙ̄ ⲡⲉ$\overline{\text{ⲭⲥ}}$. ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲥⲭⲁⲥⲧⲟⲩ ⲡⲁⲣⲁ ⲛ̄ⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ. ⲣⲉⲛⲕⲟⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ ⲁⲥⲭⲓⲧⲟⲩ ⲉⲁⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉ.

1.6: ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲥⲛ̄ⲧ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲉⲩⲣⲟⲟⲩ.

---

[1] So T. Although preceded by ⲁⲑⲁⲛⲁⲥⲓⲟⲩ ⲗⲟⲅⲟⲩ, this probably relates to the *vita* of Athanasius which precedes the gnomes in this codex. B: ⲧⲥⲩⲛⲣⲟⲇⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲛⲓⲕⲁⲓⲁ. ⲛⲉⲅⲛⲱⲙⲏ ⲛ̄ⲧⲥⲩⲛⲟⲇⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ. P: [ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉ] ⲛⲉⲕⲁ[ⲛ]ⲱⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲕ[ⲕⲗⲏ]ⲥⲓⲁ [ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲥ] ⲣ[ⲁⲓ]ⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲟⲓ ⲓⲡⲡⲟⲗⲓⲧⲟⲥ ⲛⲁ[ⲣⲭⲉⲡⲓⲥ]ⲕⲟ[ⲡⲟⲥ ⲉ]ⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ [ⲛ̄ⲣ]ⲣⲱⲙⲏ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉ ⲛⲉ[ⲅ]ⲛⲱⲙⲏ ⲛ̄ⲧⲥⲩⲛ[ⲣ]ⲟⲇⲟⲥ ⲉ[ⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ].

[2] ⲡⲭⲡⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲡⲉ is in a secondary hand, a word having been scratched out. Revillout suggests that it should read ⲟⲩⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲥ, however B reads $\overline{\text{ⲓⲥ}}$ ⲡⲉ$\overline{\text{ⲭⲥ}}$ ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲡⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ and P reads ⲡⲉ$\overline{\text{ⲭⲥ}}$ $\overline{\text{ⲓⲥ}}$ ⲡⲉⲡⲭⲟⲓⲉⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲡⲉ.

[3] ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲧⲟ̄ ⲣⲟⲩⲉⲓⲧⲉ TB. P: ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛ[ⲧⲟ̄ ⲱⲟⲟⲡ] ⲁⲣⲭⲏ.

[4] ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ P. Om TB.

[5] ⲁⲩⲧ ⲟⲩⲁⲩⲇⲟⲍⲟⲩⲥⲓⲟⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧ ⲣⲙ̄ⲡⲧⲏⲣⲟ̄ ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ ⲉⲣⲉ ⲛⲉⲓⲡⲣⲟⲫⲁⲓⲣⲏⲥⲓⲥ ⲟⲩⲱⲛⲉ̄ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ TB. Cf. P: ⲁⲩⲧ ⲟⲩⲁⲩⲇⲟⲍⲟⲩⲥⲓⲟⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲧⲏⲣⲟ̄.

[6] ⲇⲉ P. om. TB.

THE SENTENCES (ΓΝΏΜΗ) OF THE HOLY SYNOD (ΣΎΝΟΔΟΣ)[7]

1:1 God the Father is good (ἀγαθός). Christ is Lord and God,[8] and the Holy Spirit (πνα) is good (ἀγαθός).

1.2: God has no beginning (P: ἀρχή), nor (οὔτε) is there any end to his divinity, for (γάρ) he is himself the beginning (ἀρχή) and the end of all that is. There is no creation (κτίσμα) in the trinity (τριάς) but (ἀλλά) the Lord himself created all that is.

1.3: There is no other Lord but he over all his works.

1.4: He gave freewill (αὐτεξοῦσιον) to those who are in the world so that their inclination (προαίρεσις) might be manifest.[9]

1.5: Inclination (προαίρεσις) (δέ) brings some to be seated by Christ, and exalts them over (παρά) the angels (ἄγγελος). Others (δέ) it leads to hell.

1.6: God has not made anything that is evil.

---

[7] So T. Though preceded by "discourse of Athanasius", this probably relates to the preceding life of Athanasius. B: "The synod of Nicaea. The sentences of the holy synod." P: "These are the canons of the church which Hippolytus, the sainted archbishop of Rome, ordered. These are the sentences of the holy synod."

[8] So T. Revillout suggests that the text should read "Christ is good", as the word "Lord" is in a secondary hand, and written over a word which has been scratched out. However, B reads "Jesus Christ is Lord and God" and P reads "Jesus Christ is Lord and he is God." Thus for all one may suspect that Revillout is right, there is no MS support.

[9] "So that … manifest" is omitted in P.

1.7: ⲛ̄ⲕⲉⲇⲁⲓⲙⲟⲛⲓⲟⲛ ⲥⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲛ ⲥⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ. ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲥⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲩⲡⲣⲟⲥⲁⲓⲣⲉⲥⲓⲥ. ⲛ̄ⲕⲉ ⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲧⲉⲩⲡⲣⲟⲥⲁⲓⲣⲉⲥⲓⲥ ⲁⲥⲱⲣⲛ̄ ϫⲁⲥⲧⲟⲩ ⲥⲙ̄ ⲡⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲛ ⲉⲩⲁⲣⲉⲥⲕⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲡⲉⲩⲥⲏⲧ ⲙ̄ⲙⲓⲛ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲙⲛ̄ⲡⲉⲩⲧⲁⲉⲓⲟ.[10]

1.8: ⲧⲉⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲣ̄ϫⲣⲉⲓⲁ ⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲥⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁⲩⲥⲟⲛⲧⲟⲩ.[11] ⲡⲧⲏⲣⲟ̄ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟϥ ⲫ̄ϫⲣⲉⲓⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ.

1.9: ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉϥⲥⲛ̄ⲧ̄ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ϥⲟⲱ ⲉϥⲟⲩⲟϫ. ⲉⲩⲟⲩⲟⲩϫⲁⲓ[12] ⲅⲁⲣ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲥⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲛⲉⲣⲅⲓⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϥⲟⲩⲱⲟ.[13]

1.10: ⲙ̄ⲡⲉ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲥⲛ̄ⲧ̄ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲉⲓⲙⲏⲧⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ̄ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϥⲱⲏⲣⲉ. ⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲛⲧ̄ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲡϥ̄ⲡⲛⲁ̄ ⲡⲉⲧⲁⲩⲯⲁⲛⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ.[14]

1.11: ⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲥⲱⲧⲙ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱϥ.[15] ⲛⲉⲧⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱϥ ⲥⲉ ⲥⲟⲩⲧⲱⲛ ⲥⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲩⲡⲣⲟⲥⲁⲓⲣⲉⲥⲓⲥ. ⲉⲣⲉ ⲧⲉⲡⲣⲟⲥⲁⲓⲣⲉⲥⲓⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ[16] ⲥⲛ̄ ⲛⲉϥⲥⲃⲏⲩⲉ.

1.12: ⲥⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲁⲩⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲥⲟⲓⲛⲉ ⲥⲛ̄ ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ϫⲉ ⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲥⲉⲛⲕⲟⲟⲩ ϫⲉ ϫⲁⲓⲙⲱⲛ.

---

[10] ϫⲁⲥⲧⲟⲩ… ⲡⲉⲩⲧⲁⲓⲟ TB. Cf. P: ϫⲁⲥⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲥⲓ ⲧⲉⲩⲡⲣⲟⲥⲁⲓⲣⲉⲥⲓⲥ ⲉⲩⲣⲁⲛⲁⲩ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲥⲛ̄ ⲡⲉⲩⲥⲏⲩ ⲙ̄ⲙⲓⲛ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲡⲉⲩⲧⲁⲓⲟ. Although the meaning is the same, the divergence is odd, and in particular the use of Coptic words rather than Greek.

[11] ⲛ̄ⲥⲣ̄ϫⲣⲉⲓⲁ ⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲥⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁⲩⲥⲟⲛⲧⲟⲩ T. P: ⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲣϫⲣⲓⲁ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲥⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁⲩⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ. B: ⲛ̄ⲥⲣ̄ϫⲣⲓⲁ ⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲥⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁⲩⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ. Given the agreement of P and B against T we might well adopt this reading.

[12] T reads ⲉⲩⲟⲩⲟⲩϫⲁⲓ. Corrected following B.

[13] ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉϥⲥⲛ̄ⲧ̄... ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϥⲟⲩⲱⲟ om. P.

[14] ⲡϥ̄ ⲡⲛⲁ̄ ⲡⲉⲧ is inserted in a second hand in T above the line. B reads ⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲛⲧ̄ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲡⲉϥⲡⲛⲁ̄ ⲁⲩⲯⲁⲛⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ. P is distinct yet defective, reading ⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲛⲧ̄ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲡⲉϥⲡⲛⲁ̄. In spite of textual confusion the overall meaning is clear.

[15] This line is completed following BP, where T is damaged.

[16] ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ PB. Cf. T: ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ.

1.7: The demons (δαίμων) are not evil by their nature (φύσις), but by their inclination (προαίρεσις); as to the angels (ἄγγελος) of God, their inclination (προαίρεσις) principally exalts them, in goodness (ἀγαθόν), to be entirely well-pleasing (ἀρέσκειν) to God, for their own advancement and for their glorification.

1.8: For the nature (φύσις) of God has no need (χρεία) of anything that he created,[17] rather everything has need (χρεία) of God.

1.9: Nor (οὔτε) has he created anything that might remain in a state of salvation,[18] for everything is saved through the force (ἐνέργεια) of his desire to save it.[19]

1.10: God has created nothing except (εἰμήτι) by means of his Son, for (γάρ) it is through his Spirit (πνα) that God gives growth (αὔξανειν) to all creatures.[20]

1.11: God loves those who are obedient to him. Those who are obedient to him are upright in their inclination (προαίρεσις). A man's[21] inclination (προαίρεσις) is in his deeds.

1.12: Thus some men are called angels (ἄγγελος) and some called demons (δαίμων).

---

[17] He created T. BP: "That exists."

[18] So following Rossi's reading; cf. Revillout, who translates "Nothing is created which subsists for its own sake." Rossi suggests that the point is that everything is saved by God, and by no other means.

[19] "Nor has he created … to save it." Om. P.

[20] P, whilst defective, is distinct, reading "For (γάρ) it is his Spirit […] the whole creation of God."

[21] "A man's inclination" BP; T: "God's inclination."

2.1: ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲱⲱ ⲉⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲩⲛⲁⲥⲓⲥⲙⲏ ⲉⲡⲉⲩⲉⲛⲧⲟⲗⲏ. ⲡⲁⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲓⲙⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲁⲱⲟⲣⲡⲏ̄ ⲉⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ ⲙⲙⲏⲛⲉ.[22]

2.2: ⲡⲉⲧⲉ ⲛⲏⲱⲱⲣⲡ̄ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ ⲉⲩⲁⲙⲉⲗⲉⲓ ⲉⲡⲉⲩⲟⲩⲭⲁⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲓⲛ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ.[23] ⲡⲉⲧⲡⲏⲧ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲣⲁⲧⲏ̄ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲩⲱⲓⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁ ⲟⲩⲃⲟⲛⲑⲉⲓⲁ.[24]

2.3: ⲱⲟⲣⲡ̄ⲕ[25] ⲉⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ ⲛ̄ⲱⲟⲣⲡ[26] ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲥ ⲁⲧⲉⲕⲧⲉⲭⲛⲏ ϫⲉⲕⲁⲥ ⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲥⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲛⲉⲩⲃⲏⲩⲉ[27] ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲕⲥⲓϫ. ⲡⲉⲧⲱⲱⲣⲡ̄ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲉⲩⲧⲉⲭⲛⲏ ⲡⲁⲣⲁ ⲡⲛⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲉⲩⲣⲱⲃ ⲛⲁⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲣⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲣⲟⲧⲉ.

2.4: ⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁⲕⲥⲟⲧⲙⲟⲩ ⲣⲙ̄ ⲡⲛⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲕⲁⲛ ⲉⲕⲣⲣⲱⲃ ⲏ ⲉⲕⲙⲟⲟⲱⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲉ̄ ⲛⲁⲣⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ.[28]

2.5: ⲟⲩⲛ̄ ⲡⲉⲧⲭⲓⲱⲡ ⲉⲣⲉⲛⲙⲛⲥⲉ ⲟⲩⲱⲱ ⲉⲣⲟⲩ ⲣⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ. ⲭⲥⲟⲧⲡ̄ ⲉⲡⲁⲓ ⲛ̄ⲥⲓ ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲕⲟⲧⲕ̄ <ⲣⲙ>ⲡⲉⲭⲏⲓ.

2.6: ⲉⲩⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ ϫⲉ ⲡⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲉⲓⲱ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲛ̄ⲟⲃⲉ.[29]

---

[22] ⲙⲙⲏⲛⲉ P. Om. TB.

[23] ⲙ̄ⲙⲓⲛⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ T. BP: ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲁⲩ.

[24] ⲉⲩⲱⲓⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁ ⲟⲩⲃⲟⲛⲑⲉⲓⲁ T. BP: ⲉⲩⲥ ⲱⲟⲩϩ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲃⲟⲛⲑⲉⲓⲁ.

[25] P reads ⲕⲟⲩⲛⲉ.

[26] ⲛ̄ⲱⲟⲣⲡ inserted here from C. Om. TBP.

[27] P inserts ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ here.

[28] ⲡⲉⲧⲱⲱⲣⲡ̄ … ⲛⲁⲣⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ om. P.

[29] This sentence is slightly defective in T but can be supplemented from B. P has a different version of the same, prior to the warning regarding usury, ⲉⲩⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ ϫⲉ ⲡⲛⲁⲓ ⲛ̄ⲕⲁⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ. On the order of material at this point in P, and the various omissions, see the translation and the notes ad loc.

2.1: Somebody who wishes to be obedient to God pays attention to his commandments (ἐντολή). Such a person hurries daily[30] to the church (ἐκκλησία).

2.2: Anyone who does not hurry to the church is neglecting (ἀμελεῖν) his own salvation; anyone who takes recourse in God is seeking assistance (βοήθεια).[31]

2.3: Hurry to church (ἐκκλησία) first of all and afterwards to your work (τέχνη)[32] so that God may bless the work of your hands. The task of anyone who hurries to work (τέχνη), rather (παρά) than to the house of God, shall be disrespect.

2.4: Take hold of what you hear in the house of God before you work or (ἤ) go anywhere, and you will not sin.[33]

2.5: What does anyone who lends at interest desire of the church (ἐκκλησία)? Somebody who simply sleeps at home is better than that.

2.6: The church (ἐκκλησία) is called the place where sins are remitted.

---

[30] "Daily" is not in T or B.

[31] Or, if the reading of B and P is followed, "is assembling to find assistance."

[32] Cf. Revillout: "Hâte-toi vers l'Église après ton travail." This is perhaps the more obvious meaning of the Coptic of T, but does not fit the context. The word translated "first of all" is taken from the text given in C; its inclusion means that the clause makes more obvious sense as translated, and its omission is easy to explain due to the similarity of this word to that meaning "hurry."

[33] 2.3b–2.4 are absent in P.

2.7: ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲁⲣⲉ ⲡⲟⲩⲁⲡⲟⲩⲁ ⲣⲓⲙⲉ ⲉⲭⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲩⲛⲟⲃⲉ.[34] ⲟⲩⲕⲟⲩⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲉⲡⲁⲣⲉ ⲣⲓⲭⲙ̄ ⲡⲕⲁⲣ.[35] ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲱⲱⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ ⲉⲣⲣⲏⲃⲉ ⲉⲭⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲛⲛⲟⲃⲉ.

3.1: ⲡⲣⲱⲃ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ ⲡⲉⲱⲗⲏⲗ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲧⲉ ⲣⲓ ⲥⲟⲡ̄ⲥ̄.[36]

3.2: ⲡⲉⲧⲱⲁϫⲉ ⲣⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ ⲙⲁⲗⲓⲥⲧⲁ ⲉⲩⲱⲱ ⲉⲩⲥⲱⲱ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ.

3.3: ⲟⲩ̄ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲣⲏⲩ ϫⲉ ⲁⲕⲃⲱⲕ ⲁⲡⲏⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲱϫⲉ ⲕⲛⲁⲃⲱⲕ ⲉⲣⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲙⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲥ̄ⲱⲱⲩⲟ̄.

3.4: ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙⲉⲛ ⲙⲛ̄ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲱⲥⲟⲱⲩⲟ̄. ⲧⲉⲩⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲧⲁⲉⲓⲏⲩ ⲉⲣⲟⲩⲟ ⲉⲛⲉⲧⲱⲟⲟⲡ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ.[37]

3.5: ⲡⲉⲧⲧⲁⲱⲟ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲩⲧⲓⲙⲱⲣⲓⲁ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲧⲟⲗⲙⲁ ⲉ̄ⲣⲡⲃⲟⲗ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲱⲱ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ.

4.1: ⲡⲉⲧⲥⲱⲱⲧ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁ ⲟⲩⲥⲣⲓⲙⲉ ⲣⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ ⲉⲩⲧⲁⲱⲟ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲕⲟⲗⲁⲥⲓⲥ.

---

[34] So TB. Cf. P: ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲱⲱⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ ⲉⲣⲣⲏⲃⲉ ⲉⲭⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲛⲛⲟⲃⲉ. ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲟⲩⲁⲡⲟⲩⲁ ⲣⲓⲙⲉ ⲣⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ.

[35] ⲟⲩⲕⲟⲩⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ... ⲡⲕⲁⲣ m. P.

[36] ⲣⲓ ⲥⲟⲡ̄ⲥ̄ TB. P: ⲣⲓ ⲥⲟⲡ̄ⲥ̄ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ.

[37] ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙⲉⲛ... ⲉⲛⲉⲧⲱⲟⲟⲡ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ om. P.

2.7: And everyone should weep on account of their sins.[38] For (γάρ) the time on earth is brief.[39] Therefore it is fitting that we should grieve over our sins.

3.1: The work of the church is simply prayer and intercession.[40]

3.2: Anyone who speaks in church, especially (μάλιστα) during reading, is abusing God.

3.3: What good is it to go to the house of God, only to abuse him there?

3.4: Yet (μέν) God is incapable of being abused, for (γάρ) his nature (φύσις) is glorious, beyond anything that exists.[41]

3.5: Anyone (δέ) who dares (τολμᾶν) transgress the will of God is escalating his own punishment (τιμωρία).

4.1: Anyone who looks on a woman in church is escalating anger (κόλασις) against himself.

[38] Cf., in this entire passage, the distinct order of P which, as already noted, omits the two sentences following on from "bless the work of your hands" and continues: "For the church is called the place for the remission of sins. What has the church to do with anyone who gives mind to usury? Somebody who simply sleeps at home is better than that, better indeed; therefore it is fitting that we should grieve over our sins. And everyone should weep in the church."

[39].This sentence is not in P.

[40] "Prayer and intercession" TB. P: "Prayer and intercession to God."

[41] This sentence is not in P.

4.2: ⲧⲉⲥⲣⲓⲙⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲧⲕⲟⲥⲙⲉⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ ⲉⲡⲛⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ[42] ⲟⲩⲁⲑⲛⲧ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲉⲥⲣⲁⲓ ⲙⲛ̄ⲡⲉⲥⲉⲓⲱⲧ.[43] ⲧⲁⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲓⲙⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲁⲥⲱⲣⲙ̄ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲥϧⲩⲭⲏ.

4.3: ⲟⲩⲥⲣⲓⲙⲉ ⲉⲥϩⲛⲟⲩⲃ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ ⲉⲥⲛⲁⲃⲱⲕ[44] ⲉⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ ⲙⲁⲗⲓⲥⲧⲁ ⲧⲉⲧⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ̄ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲟⲩⲣⲉϥⲱⲙ̄ⲱⲉⲉⲓⲇⲱⲗⲟⲛ ⲧⲉ.

4.4: ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲃ ⲧⲁⲉⲓⲛⲩ ⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ⲁϩⲣ̄ⲙ̄ ⲡⲥⲟⲫⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲧⲉⲡⲓⲥⲧⲙⲏ ⲛ̄ⲛ̄ⲃⲁⲗ.

4.5: ⲧⲉⲧⲫⲟⲣⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ϩⲉⲛⲗⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲭⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲥⲁⲡⲉ ⲉⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ̄ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲥⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲑⲛⲧ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲉⲥϥⲱ ⲃⲏⲗ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲩⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲡⲉ ⲉϥⲟ ⲛ̄ⲱϫⲓⲗ ⲉⲥⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ϩⲉⲛⲁⲑⲛⲧ.

4.6: ⲟⲩⲥⲣⲓⲙⲉ ⲉⲱⲁⲩⲙⲉⲣⲓⲧⲥ̄ ϩⲓⲧⲙ̄ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧϩⲁⲕ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲧⲇⲓⲟⲓⲕⲏⲥⲓⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲥⲏⲓ.

4.7: ⲡⲥⲁ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲧⲱⲟⲩⲉⲓⲧ ⲟⲩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲥⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲏϩ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱϥ.

4.8: ⲕⲟⲥⲙⲉⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩϩⲁⲓ ϩⲛ̄ ϯⲟⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲓⲉ ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧϩⲁⲕ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲩⲧⲁⲡⲣⲟ. ⲉⲣⲉ ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲛⲉⲩϩⲁⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲡⲁϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ.

4.9: ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲙⲉⲣⲉ ⲕⲟⲥⲙⲉⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟ ⲱ ⲧⲉⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲁⲣⲓⲡⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲓⲥⲁⲉⲓⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲧϩⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲫⲟⲥ. ⲉⲧⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲩϩⲓⲇⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲃⲗⲟⲃ ⲙ̄ⲡⲱⲱⲛⲉ ⲱⲁⲣⲉ ⲡⲥⲁⲗⲟ ⲛ̄ϩⲛⲧⲟⲩ.

---

[42] So TB: cf. P: ⲧⲉⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲥⲕⲱⲥⲙⲉⲓ (sic) ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩϫⲉⲗϫⲉⲗ ⲉⲥⲡⲛⲧ ⲉⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲛⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ...

[43] So BP. T: ⲡⲉ ⲡⲉⲥⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲥⲣⲁⲓ.

[44] ⲉⲥⲛⲁⲃⲱⲕ. So B; no verb is found here in T, but P here has ⲉⲥⲡⲛⲧ, which implies that a verb of this sort should be found here.

4.2: A woman who dresses up (κοσμεῖν) for the house of God[45] is making a fool of her husband and her father.[46] A woman (δέ) like this will lose her soul (ψυχή).

4.3: A woman who dresses herself in gold just (μάλιστα) as she goes[47] to church (ἐκκλησία) shows herself to be like a worshipper of idols (εἴδωλον).

4.4: Gold is valued no more than eye-shadow (ἐπίστημα) by the wise (σοφός).

4.5: Any woman who wears (φέρειν) jewellery on her head is making a display of her stupidity, and whatever woman wears her hair loosened, that it to say in ringlets, is sending out an invitation (καλεῖν) to the senseless.

4.6: A woman comes to be loved by God and by men on account of her prudence and the care she takes of her house (διοίκησις).

4.7: A vain beauty is accompanied by hatred.

4.8: Adorn (κοσμεῖν) yourself for your husband by the works of your hands and the moderation of your speech. For (γάρ) the saints called their husbands "My lord."

4.9: Do not love adornment (κοσμεῖν), woman, but (ἀλλά) remember all those beauties who are in the tomb (τάφος). For (ἔτι γάρ) beauty likewise departs from anyone lying on a sickbed.

---

[45] So TB. cf. P: "A woman who adorns herself with (?)wantonness and goes to church (ἐκκλησία), that is the house of God…"

[46] So BP. T: "father and husband."

[47] No verb here is found in T, but P and B both have verbs of similar meaning. Although μάλιστα follows ἐκκλησία, rather than the verb, I have understood it to qualify this verb, understanding this to mean that she goes to church solely to make a show.

4.10: ⲕⲟⲥⲙⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲩⲩⲩⲭⲏ ⲉⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲧ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲉⲣⲏⲧ ⲉⲡⲱⲁϫⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ ⲉⲣⲟϥ.

4.11: ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲃⲉ ⲛⲁϭⲱ ⲙ̄ⲙⲛ ⲟⲩⲥⲉⲓⲙⲉ[48] ⲛ̄ⲁⲑⲏⲧ. ⲧⲉⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁ ⲡⲉⲥⲉⲓⲱⲧ[49] ⲙⲛ̄ ⲡⲉⲥⲉⲁⲓ ⲟⲩⲁⲑⲏⲧ ⲧⲉ.

4.12: ⲡⲁⲱⲛⲣⲉ ⲥⲁⲉⲱⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲥⲉⲓⲙⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲓⲕⲟⲥⲙⲉⲓ. ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲉⲓⲛ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲛⲟⲉⲓⲕ ⲉⲩⲉⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲁⲱⲕⲓⲗ ⲙⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲱⲗⲕ̄.[50]

4.13: ⲕⲛⲁⲥⲟⲩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲥⲉⲓⲙⲉ ⲉⲥⲙⲟⲥⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲃⲉ[51] ⲉⲛ̄ ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲕⲁⲑⲁⲣⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲥⲉⲱ. ⲧⲉⲧⲧⲥⲧⲏⲙ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲛⲉⲥⲃⲁⲗ ⲉⲥⲧⲁⲱⲉ ⲟⲉⲓⲱ ⲛ̄ⲧⲥⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲱⲁⲩ.[52] ⲉⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲣ̄ⲭⲣⲉⲓⲁ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ ⲁⲛ. ⲟⲩⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲱⲁⲩ ⲧⲉ ⲫⲟⲣⲉⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ.[53]

4.14: ⲟⲩⲡⲉ ⲡⲉϩⲛⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲥⲧⲏⲙ ⲛ̄ⲛⲃⲁⲗ. ⲉⲩⲥⲟⲱ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲑⲓⲕⲱⲛ ⲉⲧⲧⲁⲉⲓⲛⲩ ⲉⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲙⲕ̄ⲣⲙⲉⲥ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲛⲃⲥ.

4.15: ⲡⲉⲧ ⲕⲟⲥⲙⲉⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ ⲉⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ[54] ⲡⲁⲣⲁ ⲧⲉϥⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲉϥⲥⲱⲱ ⲙ̄ⲡⲇⲏⲙⲓⲟⲩⲣⲅⲟⲥ.

4.16: ⲉⲃⲏ ⲡⲟⲩⲉⲟ ⲉⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ ⲙ̄ⲙⲛ ⲛ̄ⲉⲓⲣ[55] ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲥⲕⲁⲛⲇⲁⲗⲓⲍⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲩⲩⲭⲏ.

4.17: ⲟⲩⲛ̄ ⲡⲉⲧⲙⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲉⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲥⲭⲏⲙⲁ[56] ⲉϥⲉⲟⲟⲩ ⲉϥⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲩⲛ̄ ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲱⲱⲧ̄ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱϥ. ⲡⲁⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲓⲙⲓⲛⲉ ⲟⲩⲁⲑⲏⲧ ⲡⲉ.

---

[48] ⲥⲉⲓⲙⲉ TB. P reads ⲣⲱⲙⲉ. Presumably an error.

[49] P: ⲧⲉⲧⲉⲛⲥ̄ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ ⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁ ⲡⲉⲥⲉⲁⲓ.

[50] Although there is some slight damage to T here, two half-lines being erased, the text is the same as B, and must therefore be adjudged as complete. Cf. P: ⲛⲉ ⲙⲁⲉⲓⲛ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲛⲟⲉⲧⲕ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲱⲕⲉⲗⲕⲓⲗ (thus omitting ⲙⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲱⲗⲕ̄.)

[51] ⲉⲥⲙⲟⲥⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲃⲉ TB(C). P: ⲉⲥⲙⲟⲟⲥ ⲉⲛ̄ ⲡⲛⲟⲃⲉ.

[52] ⲉⲥⲧⲁⲱⲉ ⲟⲉⲓⲱ ⲛ̄ⲧⲥⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲱⲁⲩ T. B is partly illegible here but supports T. P: ⲉⲥⲧⲁⲱⲟ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲥⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲱⲁⲩ.

[53] So T. B: ⲟⲩⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲱⲁⲩ ⲡⲉ ⲫⲟⲣⲉⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ (sic.) P: ⲉⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲙⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲉⲣⲭⲣⲓⲁ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ ⲁⲛ ⲟⲩⲁⲧⲱⲁⲩ ⲡⲉ.

[54] ⲉⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ om. P.

[55] P adds ⲱ ⲧⲉⲥⲉⲓⲙⲉ here.

[56] ⲟⲩⲥⲭⲏⲙⲁ PB. T: ⲟⲩⲛⲥⲭⲏⲙⲁ.

4.10: Adorn (κοσμεῖν) your souls (ψυχή) with the love of God, and give your heart to the word of God, listening to it well.

4.11: A wise man will not stay with a foolish wife;[57] for (γάρ) any woman who is not obedient to her father and husband is foolish.[58]

4.12: My son, stay away from women who love adornment (κοσμεῖν), for (γάρ) curls and jewels[59] are indications of adultery.

4.13: A woman who hates sin[60] may be known by the purity (καθαρός) of her face; a woman who puts on eye-shadow (ἐπίστημα) demonstrates her vanity all the more.[61] The body (σῶμα) has no need (χρεία) of anything such; to wear (φέρειν) such as this is vanity.

4.14: Where does eye-shadow (ἐπίστημα) come from? The noble image (εἰκών) is defaced by the smoke of lamps.[62]

4.15: Anyone who adorns himself contrary to (παρά) his nature (φύσις) in the church[63] (ἐκκλησία) is insulting the creator (δημιουργός).

4.16: Cover your face in church (ἐκκλησία) and in the streets[64] and give no scandal (σκανδαλίζειν) to any soul (ψυχή).

4.17 There are those who go about in an evil manner (σχῆμα)[65] thinking that they are drawing attention to themselves; such people (δέ) are utterly senseless.

---

[57] P reads "man." Presumably an error.

[58] P omits mention of a father.

[59] P omits "jewels" here.

[60] "Hates sin" TB(C). P: "Sits in sin" (sic. Clearly a corruption.)

[61] Or, if the reading of P is followed, "increases her vanity."

[62] Presumably the image which is defaced is the image of God, found in humanity, and defaced through the use of cosmetics.

[63] "In the church" is not in P.

[64] P adds "o woman" here.

[65] Or, possibly, "clothing."

5.1: ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲣⲱⲱⲕⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲩⲙⲟⲣⲧ̄ ⲉⲩⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲙ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲛ̄ⲛ̄ⲕⲟⲩⲓ.

5.2: ⲛⲉⲩⲟ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲟ ⲛ̄ⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ.[66]

5.3: ⲙⲁⲣⲉ ⲧⲉⲕⲣ̄ⲃⲥⲱ ⲫⲱⲡⲉ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲡⲣⲟⲥ ⲧⲉⲭⲣⲉⲓⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ[67] ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲕⲟⲥⲙⲉⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲕ ⲣ̄ⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲃⲱ. ⲡⲁⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩⲧⲁⲁϥ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲣⲓⲟⲙⲉ.[68] ⲉⲫⲭⲉ ⲕⲛⲁⲣ̄ⲙⲁⲓⲕⲟⲥⲙⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲥⲣⲓⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲁⲑⲏⲧ ⲉⲕⲫⲱⲃⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ ⲣ̄ⲛ̄ ⲟⲩ.

5.4: ⲡⲣⲟⲟⲩⲧ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲩⲕⲏ ⲉⲣⲣⲁⲓ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲥⲣⲓⲙⲉ[69] ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲏⲅⲉⲙⲱⲛ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲡⲟⲗⲓⲥ.

5.5: ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲓⲱⲛⲣⲉ ⲭⲛⲁϯⲥⲃⲱ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲭⲱⲛⲣⲉ ⲕⲁⲗⲱⲥ. ⲧⲉⲭⲱⲉⲉⲣⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲭⲛⲁⲧⲥⲁⲃⲟⲥ ⲉⲡⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ.

5.6: ⲫⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲣⲏⲅⲉⲙⲱⲛ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲕⲱⲛⲣⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲕⲭⲓⲱⲓⲡⲉ ⲉⲭⲱⲟⲩ.

5.7: ⲉⲣⲱⲁⲛ ⲧⲉⲕⲱⲉⲉⲣⲉ ⲉⲡⲓⲑⲩⲙⲉⲓ ⲉⲩⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲟⲥ ⲁⲕⲙ̄ⲡⲱⲁ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲭⲁⲣⲓⲥ[70] ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲣ̄ⲡⲉⲕⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲧⲃⲏⲏⲧⲥ̄[71] ⲣⲓⲧⲙ̄ ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ. ⲡⲭⲟⲓⲉⲥ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲁⲩⲱ <ⲉ>ⲭⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲩⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ.[72]

---

[66] ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ T, in the hand of a corrector. PB: ⲉⲣⲟⲩ.

[67] ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ TP; ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲕⲥⲱⲙⲁ B.

[68] ⲡⲁⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩⲧⲁⲁϥ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲣⲓⲟⲙⲉ T. P: ⲡⲁⲓ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩⲧⲁⲁϥ ⲉⲩⲕⲟⲥⲙⲓⲥⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲣⲓⲟⲙⲉ.

[69] ⲉⲣⲣⲁⲓ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲥⲣⲓⲙⲉ B. P: ⲉⲣⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲭⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲥⲣⲓⲙⲉ. T: ⲉⲣⲣⲁⲓ.

[70] ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲭⲁⲣⲓⲥ B. T: ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲭⲁⲣⲓⲥ. P: ⲁⲕⲙⲁⲧⲉ ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲙⲟⲧ ⲉⲣⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲭⲱⲥ. Possibly the underlying Greek is ὑπερήφανη χάρις.

[71] So B. T is defective here, with much scratched out. P: ⲁⲩⲱ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲣ̄ⲡⲉⲕⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲣⲁⲧⲉⲙ ⲡⲉⲩⲭⲟⲥⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲏⲏⲧⲥ̄.

[72] So TB. Cf. P: ⲡⲭⲟⲓⲉⲥ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲩⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲩⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ.

5.1: A man who shaves his beard desires to be like a child, in ignorance.

5.2: Those who are without knowledge are without knowledge of themselves.

5.3: Your clothes should serve (πρός) your bodily (σῶμα) necessities (χρεία), and you should not adorn (κοσμεῖν) yourself with hair, for (γάρ) this is for women.[73] If you love adornment like a senseless woman, in what way are you any different from her?

5.4: For (γάρ) a man is set over his wife like a governor (ἡγεμών) of a city (πόλις).

5.5: A man who loves his sons will instruct his sons well (καλῶς). He will give his daughters instruction in the law (νόμος).

5.6: Be as a governor (ἡγεμών) to your children and you shall have no shame on their account.

5.7: If your daughter desires (ἐπιθυμεῖν) a state of virginity (παρθένος) you obtain a mighty grace[74] for on her account you will be remembered by the Lord. For (γάρ) the Lord is holy and loves his holy ones.[75]

[73] "…for this is for women." TB. P: "…this is adornment (κόσμησις) for women."

[74] "Mighty" supplied from B, not in T. P reads: "You have been made worthy of grace on high." Possibly the original was "exalted grace."

[75] So TB; P: For the Lord loves all his holy ones.

6.1: ⲟⲩⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲃⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲉⲥⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲱⲛⲥ̄[76] ⲉⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁ.[77] ⲛⲓⲙ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲉⲱⲱⲁϫⲉ ⲉⲡⲁⲛⲁⲓ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ[78] ⲛ̄ⲧⲁ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙⲉⲣⲓⲧⲥ̄ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲉⲥϩⲃⲏⲩⲉ.[79] ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲁϥⲥⲟⲓⲗⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲫⲱⲛⲣⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲉⲣⲓⲧ.[80] ⲉⲩⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲛ̄ⲁⲅⲉⲛⲉⲧⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲭ̄ⲥ̄[81] ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟϥ ⲡⲉ ϩⲙ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲉ.[82] ⲉⲩⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ϩⲱⲱⲥ ⲉⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁ ϫⲉ ⲧⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ.[83] ⲁⲩⲱ ϩⲙ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲥ ⲧⲉⲛⲧⲁⲥϫⲡⲟ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁϥⲡⲗⲁⲥⲥⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ. ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲧ̄ⲥⲱϫ̄ⲃ̄ ϫⲉ ⲁⲥϫⲡⲟϥ[84] ⲛ̄ⲥⲓ ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁ[85] ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲥ ϩⲱⲱⲥ[86] ⲙ̄ⲡⲥ̄ⲧⲁⲕⲟ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲥⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲓⲁ. ⲉⲁⲥⲙⲓⲥⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲛⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣ. ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲛ̄ϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟϥ ⲁϥϩⲁⲣⲉϩ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ ⲛⲁϥ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲁϩⲟ ⲉϥⲧⲁⲓⲛⲩ.[87] ⲙ̄ⲡⲉ ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲡϩⲟ ⲛ̄ϩⲟⲟⲩⲧ ⲉⲛⲉϩ ⲛ̄ⲱⲙⲙⲟ. ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲣⲱ ⲁⲥⲱⲧⲟⲣⲧ̄ⲣ̄ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲉⲥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ ⲉⲧⲉⲥⲙⲏ ⲛ̄ⲅⲁⲃⲣⲓⲏⲗ ⲡⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ. ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲛⲉⲥⲟⲩⲱⲙ ⲁⲛ ϩⲱⲥ ⲉⲥⲥⲁⲛⲱ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲉⲱⲁⲥⲟⲩⲱⲙ[88] ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲧⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲥⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ ϫⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲥⲙⲟⲩ ϩⲁⲑⲏ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲥⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲱ.[89]

---

[76] ⲉⲥⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲱⲛⲥ̄ T. BP: ⲙⲁⲣⲉⲥⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲱⲛⲥ̄.

[77] P adds ⲧⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲙⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ here.

[78] ⲙ̄ⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ, (in T, without the article) is according to Revillout, in a secondary hand and has, he suggests, replaced ⲡⲉⲭ̄ⲥ̄. However, the reading ⲙ̄ⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ is found in B and P.

[79] P adds ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩ.

[80] So TB. Cf. P: ⲁϥϫⲟⲟⲩ ⲙⲡⲉⲫⲱⲛⲣⲉ ⲁⲫⲟⲩⲱϩ ⲛϩⲛⲧⲥ̄. This is conceivably the correct reading.

[81] ⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲭ̄ⲥ̄ TB. P: ⲡ(ⲉ)ⲓⲱⲧ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲭ̄ⲥ̄ ⲓ̄ⲥ̄ ⲡⲉⲛϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ.

[82] ϩⲙ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲉ BP; om. T.

[83] ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲭ̄ⲥ̄ BP. T: ⲧⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ.

[84] ⲁⲥϫⲡⲟϥ. ⲁⲥⲛⲁⲥⲧⲏ̄ B. Since the words are so close in meaning, the variation is unexpected.

[85] P adds ⲧⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲟⲥ.

[86] ϩⲱⲱⲥ; P, whilst structured differently, tends to support its inclusion.

[87] So T, supported largely by B. Cf. P: ⲁⲥⲙⲓⲥⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲛϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟϥ ϩⲙ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲉ. ⲁϥϩⲁⲣⲉϩ ⲉⲣⲁⲥ ⲛⲁϥ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲁϩⲟ ⲉϥⲧⲟⲃⲉ.

[88] B adds ⲛ̄ⲥⲓ ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁ here.

[89] ⲙ̄ⲡⲉ ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁ... ϩⲁⲑⲏ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲥⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲱ is utterly distinct in P which reads: ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲛⲉⲥϫⲓⲧⲣⲟⲫⲏ̄ ⲧⲉⲛⲅⲁⲃⲣⲓⲏⲗ ⲡⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ. ⲛⲉⲥⲟⲩⲱⲙ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲁⲛ ϩⲱⲥ ⲉⲥⲥⲁⲛⲱ ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲱⲙⲁ.

6.1: A wise virgin (παρθένος) is like Mary.[90] Who can speak of the blessedness of the mother of the Lord, whom God loved on account of her deeds?[91] On this account his beloved son dwelt in her.[92] The unoriginate (ἀγένητος) Father is called the Father of Christ,[93] and this he is in truth.[94] Mary, likewise, is called the Mother of Christ,[95] and in truth she gave birth to the one who formed (πλάσσειν) her. He was not (οὔτε) diminished by being borne by Mary,[96] nor for her part[97] did she suffer any loss of her virginity (παρθενεία). She gave birth to our Saviour (σωτήρ), but (ἀλλά) for his part he guarded her like a precious treasure.[98] Mary never saw the face of a strange man, on which account she was disturbed on hearing the voice of the angel (ἄγγελος) Gabriel. She ate not for the nourishment of the body (σῶμα) but (ἀλλά) she[99] ate on account of the necessity (ἀνάγκη) of her nature (φύσις), so that she would not die before her time.[100]

---

[90] So T. BP: "Let a wise virgin be like Mary." P further adds here "the mother of the Lord."

[91] So TB: P: "… on account of her deeds of goodness."

[92] So TB. Cf. P: "…he sent his son to be within her."

[93] "Father of Christ" TB. P: "Father of Jesus Christ our Lord."

[94] "In truth" is not found in T.

[95] "Mother of Christ", BP: T: "Mother of the Lord."

[96] P adds "the virgin."

[97] "For her part" is not in T.

[98] So TB; cf. P: "She gave birth to our Lord, but in truth. He guarded her like an excellent treasure."

[99] So T. B: "Mary ate."

[100] The text of P is utterly distinct from "Mary never saw" to "die before her time." It reads: "She was nourished (τροφή) by the angel (ἄγγελος) Gabriel, for she ate not for the nourishment of the body (σῶμα)." Possibly the text read was corrupt and the scribe attempted to make sense of it by ascribing feeding activity to Gabriel.

ⲛⲉⲥⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲡⲉⲥⲕⲱⲕⲁϩⲛⲩ ⲙ̄ⲙⲓⲛ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ. ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲣⲱ ⲙⲉⲥⲕⲁ ⲛⲉⲥⲟⲓⲭ ⲉⲣ̄ ⲙ̄ⲡⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲥⲡⲁⲗⲗⲉⲓⲛ ⲉⲛⲉϩ.[101] ⲛⲓⲙ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁϥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲱⲁⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲡϩⲟ ⲛⲧⲉⲓⲣⲉϥ ⲭ ⲡⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲛⲉϩ.[102] ⲛⲉⲥⲁⲛⲁⲭⲱⲣⲉⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲡⲉ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲥⲛⲓ ⲙⲁⲁⲩⲥ ⲉⲩⲇⲓⲁⲕⲟⲛⲉⲓ ⲛⲁⲥ ϩⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲛⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ[103] ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲉⲥⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲙ̄ⲙⲓⲛ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ. ⲉⲥⲱⲁⲛⲛⲟⲩⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲃⲱⲕ ⲱⲁⲣⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲥⲓ ⲧⲉⲥⲙⲁⲁⲩ[104] ⲛⲉⲙⲉⲥⲟⲙ̄ⲥⲟⲙ ⲉⲧⲁⲩⲉ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲱⲁϫⲉ ⲛⲁⲥ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁ ⲡⲉϩⲱⲃ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲧⲉ. ⲉⲃⲟⲗϫⲉ ⲁⲥⲧⲉⲣⲕⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲧⲁⲙⲁⲥ ⲉⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ϩⲱⲃ ⲉⲡⲁⲡⲉⲓⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲡⲉ.[105] ⲛⲉϩⲙⲟⲟⲥ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲡ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲉϩⲟ ⲥⲱⲱϥ̄ ⲉⲙ̄ⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲱⲁ ⲉⲃⲟⲗϫⲉ ⲛⲉⲥⲱⲗⲏⲗ ⲡⲉ ⲉϫⲛ̄ ⲱϫⲛ̄.[106] ⲛⲉⲣⲉ ⲛⲉⲥⲥⲛⲏⲩ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲑⲩⲙⲉⲓ ⲉⲱⲁϫⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲉⲥⲁⲛⲓϫⲉ ⲉⲱⲁϫⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ.[107] ⲛⲉⲣⲉ ⲛⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲏⲩ ⲱⲁⲣⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ϩⲁϩ ⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲡ ⲉⲩⲑⲉⲱⲣⲉⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϩⲁⲣⲁⲕⲧⲏⲣ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲥⲡⲟⲗⲓⲧⲉⲓⲁ ⲉⲩⲣ̄ⲱⲡⲏⲣⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ.[108] ⲛⲉⲥⲛ̄ⲕⲟⲧⲕ̄ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲡⲣⲟⲥ ⲧⲉϩⲣⲏⲥⲓⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡϩⲓⲛⲏⲃ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲧⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ϩⲱⲥ ⲉⲥ† ⲙ̄ⲧⲟⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲥⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲁⲛ. ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲡⲕⲱⲕⲁϩⲛⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲥⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲉⲛⲉϩ.[109] ⲉⲥⲱⲁⲛⲛⲟⲩ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲫⲟⲣⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲧⲏⲛ ⲛⲉⲱⲁⲥⲱⲧⲁⲙ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲥⲃⲁⲗ ⲡⲉ.[110]

---

[101] ⲟⲩⲧⲉ... ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲥⲡⲁⲗⲗⲉⲓⲛ ⲉⲛⲉϩ B and P with some minor distinctions. T is difficult to read.

[102] ⲛⲓⲙ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁϥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲱⲁⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲡϩⲟ ⲛⲧⲉⲓⲣⲉϥ ⲭ ⲡⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲛⲉϩ P. Cf. B: ⲛⲓⲙ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁϥ ⲁⲡⲟⲗⲁⲩⲉ ⲉⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲡϩⲟ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲑⲉⲟⲧⲟⲕⲟⲥ ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁ ⲉⲛⲉϩ. Om. T.

[103] ⲛⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ P. Om. TB.

[104] ⲛ̄ⲥⲓ ⲧⲉⲥⲙⲁⲁⲩ P. Om. TB.

[105] So P. Cf. TB: ⲉⲃⲟⲗϫⲉ ⲁⲥⲧⲁⲣⲕⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲧⲣⲉⲥⲧⲁⲛⲟⲥ ⲉⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱ ⲉⲡⲁⲡⲉⲓⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲡⲉ.

[106] So T. B: ⲛⲉⲥϩⲙⲟⲟⲥ ⲇⲉ ϩⲓ ⲡⲉⲛⲛ̄ⲧ. ⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲉⲥⲟ ⲙⲛ̄ⲡⲉⲥϩⲛⲧ ⲥⲱⲱϥ̄ ⲙ̄ⲙⲛⲁⲱⲁ ⲉⲃⲟⲗϫⲉ ⲛⲉⲥⲱⲗⲏⲗ ⲉϫⲛ̄ ⲱϫⲛ̄. P: ⲡⲉⲥⲱⲗⲏⲗ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲉ ⲁϫⲛ̄ ⲱϫⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲩ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲙⲡϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲩⲱⲛ.

[107] So B. TP: ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲉⲙⲉⲥⲁⲛⲓϫⲉ.

[108] So T, supported by P. Cf. B: ⲛⲉⲣⲉ ⲛⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲛⲏⲩ ⲛ̄ϩⲁϩ ⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲡ. ⲉⲩⲑⲉⲱⲣⲉⲓ ⲙ̄ⲛⲟⲥ ⲉⲩⲣ̄ⲱⲛⲏⲣⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϩⲁⲣⲁⲕⲧⲏⲣ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲥⲡⲟⲗⲉϯⲁ.

[109] ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲡⲕⲱⲕⲁϩⲛⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲥⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲉⲛⲉϩ T. Om. P, cf. supra. B: ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲡⲕⲱⲕⲁϩⲛⲩ ⲉⲛⲉϩ.

[110] So B. T is damaged and partly illegible here though what may be read supports B. Om. P.

For (γάρ) she had no knowledge of her own nakedness. She did not (οὔτε) put her hands outside, nor ever did she wave (πάλλειν) them. For (γάρ) who at all is worthy of looking upon the face of the one who bore God?[111] She remained (ἀναχωρεῖν) in the house alone, served (διακονεῖν) by angels (ἄγγελος) and by her own mother.[112] If her mother[113] came in to her she was unable to say anything to her except concerning the matter at hand, because she had sworn not to speak of any business of this world. She would settle herself with her face turned at all times to the east because she was praying without ceasing.[114] When her brothers desired (ἐπιθυμεῖν) to speak with her she forbore (ἀνέχειν) conversation with them. For (γάρ) angels (ἄγγελος) would approach her frequently; they would look upon (θεωρεῖν) her character (χαρακτήρ) and her conduct (πολιτεία) and admire.[115] She would sleep only out of the necessity (χρῆσις) for sleeping and so give no rest to her body (σῶμα). Nor did she ever look upon the nakedness of her own body (σῶμα);[116] if she put on (φέρειν) a garment she would close her eyes.

---

[111] So P. T has nothing here, B reads: "for who is at all worthy to have the advantage (ἀπολαύειν) of looking on the face of Mary the Mother of God (θεοτόκος)."

[112] So P. TB omit mention of angels.

[113] "Her mother" P; TB lack a specific subject.

[114] So T. B reads: "She would settle herself away from the west, her face and her heart turned to the east because she would pray without ceasing." Cf. P: "For she prayed without ceasing at all times, both day and night."

[115] So TP; cf. B: "Angels would come frequently. They would look upon her, admiring her character and conduct."

[116] So T. B: "Nor did she ever look upon her nakedness." P omits this entire sentence.

ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁϣⲁⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲥϩⲁⲣⲛⲓⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲩϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧ̄ⲥ̄ ⲛ̄ⲥⲓ ⲡⲥⲱⲛ̄ⲧ̄ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉϩⲓⲟⲙⲉ.[117] ⲛⲉⲥⲟ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲉϩⲁϩ ⲛ̄ϩⲱⲃ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲃⲓⲟⲥ[118] ⲉⲃⲟⲗϫⲉ ⲛⲉⲥⲟⲩⲏⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ϩⲟⲙⲉⲗⲓⲁ[119] ⲛ̄ⲛⲉϩⲓⲟⲙⲉ. ⲛ̄ⲧⲁ ⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲟⲩⲱϣ̄ⲧ̄ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲩⲥⲱⲛ̄ⲧ̄ ⲧⲏⲣⲟ̄ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟ̄ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲡⲉⲧⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ.[120] ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲁⲩⲥⲟⲧⲡⲥ̄ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲩⲙⲁⲁⲩ. ⲉⲱϫⲉ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲟⲉ ⲟⲩⲱⲱ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲟⲥ[121] ⲙⲁⲣⲉⲥⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲱⲛⲥ̄ ⲉⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁ.[122] ⲧⲁⲓ ϫⲉ ⲛⲁⲙⲉ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲧⲥⲱⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡϫⲟⲓⲉⲥ.[123]

6.2: ⲟⲩⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲟⲥ ⲉⲙⲉⲥⲛⲏⲥⲧⲉⲩⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲏⲛⲉ ⲱⲁⲣⲟⲩϩⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲱⲃⲟⲙ ⲙⲛ̄ⲟⲥ ⲉ̄ⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲟⲥ. ⲧⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲟⲥ[124] ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲥⲱⲟⲟⲡ ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲡⲉⲥⲣⲁⲛ.

6.3: ⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲥ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉϫⲓϩⲁⲓ[125] ⲉϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ ⲛⲧⲉⲡⲟⲣⲛⲉⲩⲉ.

---

[117] So B. T is corrupt to the point of illegibility. P supports the sense.

[118] So TB; P ⲧⲉⲡⲉⲓⲕⲟⲥⲛⲟⲥ.

[119] ⲛ̄ϩⲟⲙⲉⲗⲓⲁ P. TB ⲛ̄ⲑⲉⲟⲛⲟⲗⲟⲅⲓⲁ, surely in error.

[120] So B. T: ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁ T. Cf. however P, tending to support B: ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲉⲛⲡⲉⲧ ⲧⲛⲧⲱⲛ ⲉⲣⲁⲥ.

[121] ⲉ̄ⲣⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲟⲥ B. However note P, supporting T: ⲉⲱϫⲉ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲟⲩⲉⲓ ϫⲉ ⲉⲥⲟⲩⲱⲱ ⲉⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲟⲥ...

[122] ⲙⲁⲣⲉⲥⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲱⲛⲥ̄ ⲉⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁ TB: cf. P: ⲙⲁⲣⲉⲥ ϩⲁⲣⲉϩ ⲉⲛⲉϩⲃⲛⲧⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲟⲥ.

[123] So P. T: ⲧⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡϫⲟⲓⲉⲥ, taking the subject to be Mary, B likewise, but also apparently preserving something of P's reading: ⲧⲥⲱⲛⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲉⲩⲙⲁⲁⲩ.

[124] So TP. B: ⲧⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲓⲁ.

[125] So TB. P adds ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲓⲥϩⲓⲛⲉ. Possibly a scribal gloss by somebody who did not understand the subsequent reference to ⲡⲟⲣⲛⲉⲩⲉ.

Because of the greatness of her purity (ἁγνεία) the way of women was not within her. She was ignorant of much regarding life (βίος)[126] because she distanced herself from the company (ὁμιλία)[127] of women. The Lord looked out over all his creation and saw nothing resembling her.[128] Therefore he chose her to be his mother. So (οὖν) if anyone desires to be called a virgin[129] (παρθένος) she should be like Mary.[130] On this account she is called sister of the mother of the Lord. [131]

6.2: A virgin (παρθένος) who does not fast (νηστεύειν) daily until the evening lacks the ability to be a virgin (παρθένος). For (γάρ) a virgin (παρθένος)[132] should deserve (κατά) her name.

6.3: It is better to take a husband[133] than to fornicate (πορνεύειν).

---

[126] So TB. P: "worldly things",

[127] So P. TB "confession" (ὁμολογία), probably a copyist's error.

[128] So B. T: "resembling Mary. Cf. however P, tending to support B: "He found nobody who was like her."

[129] B: "… act as a virgin." However note P, supporting T: "… if anyone desires that she should be called a virgin."

[130] "… she should be like Mary" TB: cf. P: "… she should guard her virginity in all things."

[131] So P. T: "she is the mother of the Lord", taking the subject to be Mary, B likewise, but also apparently preserving something of P's reading: "She is the sister of the Lord and his mother."

[132] "A virgin", TP. "Virginity" B.

[133] P adds "and to take a wife." As suggested in the apparatus this may be a scribal gloss in the light of the statement that this is better than fornication.

6.4: ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲛ ⲉϫⲓⲣⲁⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲧⲥⲓⲟ ⲛ̄ⲟⲉⲓⲕ ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲣⲓⲛⲏⲃ. ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲣⲉ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲗⲁⲙⲡⲁⲥ ⲉⲁⲥϫⲉⲛⲁ.

6.5: ⲙⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲟⲥ ⲕⲟⲥⲙⲉⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ. ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲣⲱ ⲙⲉⲩⲉⲓⲁ ⲡⲉⲩⲣⲟ. ⲧⲉⲩϣⲟⲣⲡ̄ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲥⲡⲟⲩⲇⲏ ⲡⲉ ⲧⲱⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲣⲧⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲫⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡϫⲱⲱⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲱϣ. ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϣⲁⲩⲣ̄ⲣⲱⲃ ⲛ̄ⲟⲓϫ ϫⲓⲛ ϫⲡ̄ⲥⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ϣⲁ ϫⲡ̄ⲩⲓⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲡⲉ.[134] ⲧⲥⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ϣϣⲣⲡ̄ ⲉϣⲁⲩⲁⲩ ⲉⲩⲱϣ. ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲛ ϫⲉ ϫⲓⲛ ϫⲡ̄ⲩⲓⲧⲉ.[135] ⲧⲉⲩⲕⲟⲥⲙⲓⲥⲓⲥ ⲧⲏⲣ̄ⲥ̄ ⲉⲥⲱⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗⲣ̄ⲙ̄ ⲡⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ. ⲟⲩⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲟⲥ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲥⲁⲙⲉⲗⲉⲓ ⲉⲧⲁⲛⲁⲅⲛⲱⲥⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ⲥ̄ⲛⲁⲉⲓⲙⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲡⲟⲩⲱϣ[136] ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲥⲛⲩⲙⲫⲓⲟⲥ.

6.6: ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲣⲏⲩ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲕⲱⲣ̄ⲧ̄ ⲣⲁⲧⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲣⲟⲟⲩⲉ. ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲩⲡⲉ ⲡⲣⲏⲩ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲛⲁⲭⲏ ⲣⲁⲧⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲥⲣⲓⲙⲉ ⲉⲥⲣⲙⲟⲟⲥ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲣⲁⲓ.

6.7: ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲛⲁⲭⲏ[137] ⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲉⲥⲣⲟⲓⲧⲉ ⲟⲛⲁⲩⲉⲓⲁⲩⲁⲛ ⲛⲉⲥⲕⲉⲡⲁⲑⲟⲥ ⲟⲙ̄ⲙⲓⲛⲉ ⲙⲓⲛⲉ. ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧϣⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲑⲃⲥⲱ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲁⲩⲁⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲟⲣ̄ⲧ. ⲧⲉⲧϫⲟⲟⲥⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲥⲣ̄ⲃⲥⲟ ⲣⲛ̄ ⲟⲩϣⲟⲩⲥⲟⲩ[138] ⲧⲉⲥϧⲩⲭⲏ ⲕⲛⲏ ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲣⲁ[139] ⲟⲩⲥⲟⲟⲩⲡⲉ.

6.8: ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲛⲁⲭⲏ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲃⲉ ⲙⲉⲥϣⲁϫⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲣⲟⲟⲩⲧ ⲉⲡⲧⲏⲣ̄ⲕ̄. ⲧⲁⲑⲏⲧ ⲇⲉ ϣⲁⲥⲥⲱⲃⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲓⲣ̄ϣⲓⲣⲉ.[140]

---

[134] ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲡⲉ supplied from B.

[135] This sentence is absent from B. T is damaged here but the lacunae may readily be completed from P which is here very close to T.

[136] ⲉⲡⲟⲩⲱϣ TB; P: ⲉⲡⲕⲉⲟⲩⲱϣ.

[137] ⲙⲟⲛⲁⲭⲏ TB; P: ⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲟⲥ.

[138] ⲣⲛ̄ ⲟⲩϣⲟⲩⲥⲟⲩ supplied from P. Om. TB.

[139] ⲕⲛⲏ ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲣⲁ: so P. Revillout read T as ⲕⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲣⲁ ⲟⲩⲥⲟⲟⲩⲡⲉ, whereas Rossi suggested that the text should read ⲕⲛⲏ ⲡⲁⲣⲁ. P would appear to support Rossi's suggestion.

[140] ⲛⲉⲓⲣ̄ϣⲓⲣⲉ: so TB. P: ⲛⲉⲓⲁⲧⲣⲏⲧ.

6.4: If she does not wish to marry she should not satiate herself with bread or sleep, so that (μήποτε) her lamp (λαμπάς) should not be extinguished.

6.5: Virgins (παρθένος) should not adorn (κοσμεῖν) themselves, nor wash their faces. Their first concern (σπουδή) is to rise at dawn and to take up a book and read. And if they labour with their hands, this is from the second to the ninth hour of the day. The first two hours are set aside for reading, as is the time from the ninth hour on.[141] For their entire ordering (κόσμησις) is by means of the word (λόγος). For a virgin (παρθένος) who neglects (ἀμελεῖν) reading (ἀνάγνωσις) will not know[142] what her bridegroom (νυμφίος) desires.

6.6: What is the good of a fire close to straw? And what is the good of a *monachē* close to a woman who lives with her husband?

6.7: The passions (πάθος) of a *monachē*[143] whose clothes are coloured are similarly unstable. Propriety in dress is in the colour of wool. Whoever dyes her clothes in idleness[144] has a soul (ψυχή) which is blackened like (παρά) a sack.[145]

6.8: A wise *monachē* does not speak to men at all; the senseless sports with the young.[146]

---

[141] This sentence is absent in B, but present both in P and T.

[142] Cf. P: Will also not know.

[143] So TB, P reading "virgin."

[144] "In idleness" is only found in P.

[145] Such is the reading of P. TB are less clear; this is one possible reading, though it is also possible to read them as "has a soul which remains like a sack" (presumably empty.)

[146] Young: TB; P reads "senseless".

6.9: ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲁⲛ ⲉⲧⲧⲁⲉⲓⲛⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲁⲑⲏⲧ ⲛ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲧⲁⲁϥ ⲛ̄ⲉⲓⲇⲱⲗⲟⲛ ⲧⲁⲓ ⲧⲉ ⲑⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲟⲥ ⲉⲩϯ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ ⲉⲣⲉⲛ ⲁⲑⲏⲧ ⲛ̄ⲥⲣⲓⲙⲉ.[147] ⲡⲣⲁⲛ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲟⲥ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲣⲁⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ.[148]

6.10: ⲙⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲛⲁⲭⲏ ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲟⲥ[149] ⲛⲁϭⲱⲱⲧ̄ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁ ⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲃ[150] ⲙⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲁⲣⲕⲁⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ. ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲟⲧⲥ̄ ⲥⲟⲧⲡ̄ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲥⲛⲁⲩ.[151]

6.11: ⲛⲑⲉ ⲛⲉⲧⲥⲟⲧⲛ̄ ⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲃ ϩⲛ̄ ⲑⲩⲗⲏ[152] ⲧⲁⲓ ⲧⲉⲑⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲥⲟⲧⲡ̄ ⲉⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲟⲥ ϩⲛ̄ ⲛⲁⲣⲉⲧⲏ.

6.12: ⲧⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲓⲁ ⲇⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲉⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲥ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲡⲓⲥⲧⲏⲙⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉϩⲩⲭⲏ ⲟⲩⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲥⲟϭ ⲧⲉ.[153]

---

[147] The text here is given according to T. B and P employ different constructions, though the meaning is the same.

[148] This sentence is not found in P.

[149] So TB. P has a further, illegible, word here. Lammeyer suggests ⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲃⲉ.

[150] P has ⲙⲛ̄ followed by a further illegible word. Lammeyer suggests ⲟⲩϩⲁⲧ.

[151] ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲥⲛⲁⲩ, so TB; P: ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ.

[152] ϩⲛ̄ ⲑⲩⲗⲏ is partially restored from B where T cannot be read. P supports the reconstruction.

[153] Read from B, with support from P. T has been defaced with illegible correction. For ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲡⲓⲥⲧⲏⲙⲉⲓ P reads ⲛⲧⲉⲡⲓⲥⲧⲏⲱ. This may represent ἐπίστασις, though Lammeyer suggests that ἐπιστήμη lies behind this as well.

6.9: Just as senseless men give the honourable name of God to idols (εἴδωλον), so they give the name of virgin (παρθένος) to senseless women likewise. For the name of virginity (παρθένος) is a name of divinity.[154]

6.10: No virgin (παρθένος) *monachē*[155] would look upon gold or[156] pearls (μαργαρίτης); what she possesses is better than both of these.[157]

6.11: Like somebody who chooses gold from among material things (ὕλη), so is someone who chooses virginity (παρθένος) from among the virtues (ἀρετή.)

6.12: Virginity (παρθενία) of the body (σῶμα) without training (ἐπιστήμη) of the soul (ψυχή) is foolishness.

[154] This sentence is not found in P. It is, indeed, possible that it is a gloss.

[155] So TB. P has a further, illegible, word here, possibly "wise."

[156] So TB. P has a further "nor", followed by a further illegible word, possibly "silver."

[157] So TB. P: "… any of these."

6.13: ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ ⲡϩⲏⲩ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲟⲥ ⲉⲥⲥⲉⲩϩ ⲛⲟⲩⲃ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ. ⲏ ⲁⲩ ⲡⲉ ⲡϩⲏⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲟⲩϩ ⲛ̄ϩⲉⲛⲧⲁⲓⲃⲉ ⲛ̄ϩⲟⲓⲧⲉ ⲉⲥⲱⲟⲩⲱⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ[158] ⲭⲉ ⲁⲛ̄ⲟ ⲟⲩⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲟⲥ. ⲡⲛⲁ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲟⲩϩ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲟⲥ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲁϩⲟ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲥ ⲯⲩⲭⲏ. ⲛⲉⲧⲕⲛⲕⲁϩⲏⲩ ⲉⲥⲱⲁⲛ̀ⲧ ϩⲓⲙⲟⲩ ⲁⲥⲥⲱⲟⲩϩ ⲛⲁⲥ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲁϩⲟ.[159]

6.14: ⲧⲙ̄ⲛ̄ⲧⲱⲁⲩ ⲧⲏ̄ⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲓⲁ ⲧⲉ ⲧϩⲩⲡⲟⲧⲁⲅⲏ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲁⲡⲟⲧⲁⲅⲏ ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲥⲧⲥⲓⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲟⲉⲓⲕ.[160] ⲟⲩⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ ⲉⲥⲱⲓⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁ ⲟⲩⲱⲙ ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ ⲡⲉ ⲭ̄ⲥ̄ ⲛ̄ⲱⲱⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ. ⲉⲙⲉϩ ϩⲛⲧⲥ ⲛⲟⲉⲓⲕ ⲉⲡⲧⲏ̄ⲣⲫ.[161]

6.15: ⲧⲉⲥⲫⲣⲁⲅⲓⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲧ̄ⲃ̄ⲃⲟ ⲧⲉ ⲛⲏⲥⲧⲓⲁ. ⲡⲉⲧⲧⲁⲱⲟ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲩⲧⲣⲟⲫⲏ ⲛⲁⲧⲁⲱⲉ ⲛⲉⲩⲁⲱⲱⲛⲉ.[162]

6.16: ⲥⲁϩⲱⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲥⲱⲱⲩ̄ⲧ̄ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁ ⲧⲉⲧⲉⲟⲩⲛⲧ̄ϩⲁⲓ[163] ⲭⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲩⲕⲣⲓⲛⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲕ ϩⲱⲥ ⲱⲁⲗⲣ̄ⲡⲉ.[164]

---

[158] P adds ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓⲉ ⲭⲱⲟⲩ here and continues the phrase: ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲥⲭⲱⲙⲛⲟⲥ ⲭⲉ ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ... The variation in the latter part of the sentence may simply amount to a smoother Coptic rendering of the Greek, but the former variation indicates a distinct Greek text.

[159] So TB. Cf. P: ⲡⲛⲁ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲟⲩϩ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲧⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲓⲁ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲧⲁⲛϩⲟ ⲛⲧⲉⲯⲩⲭⲏ ⲉⲧⲉⲡⲁⲓ ⲡⲉ ⲭⲉϩⲱⲃ̄ⲃ̄ ⲛⲛⲉⲧⲕⲛⲕⲁϩⲏⲩ. See the note to the translation.

[160] So T. B reads ⲧⲁⲅⲁⲡⲏ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲉⲥ[ ]ⲥⲓⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲟⲉⲓⲕ. P reads ⲧⲁⲡⲟⲩⲁⲕⲧⲕⲏ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲉⲥⲧⲥⲓⲟⲥ ⲛⲟⲉⲓⲕ.

[161] Sentence complete in P only. T has a lacuna where ⲛ̄ⲱⲱⲉ is found, and does not include ⲉⲣⲟⲥ. B has only a few letters of ⲉⲥⲱⲓⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁ ⲟⲩⲱⲙ and reads ⲛ̄ⲗⲁⲁⲩ rather than ⲉⲡⲧⲏ̄ⲣⲫ, presumably a secondary revision.

[162] So B. For ⲛⲁⲧⲁⲱⲉ T has ⲛⲁⲱⲉ, which Revillout emends to ⲧⲁⲱⲉ P has some differences (e.g. ⲅⲁⲣ for ⲇⲉ) but conforms in meaning.

[163] ⲧⲉⲧⲉⲟⲩⲛⲧ̄ϩⲁⲓ B. T only partially legible.

[164] Sentence absent in P. It may be misplaced in TB.

6.13: What good is a virgin (παρθένος) who stores up gold? Or (ἤ) what the use of one who stores up clothing in boxes whilst boasting of herself "I am a virgin (παρθένος)."[165] The place set aside for a virgin (παρθένος) is the treasure of her soul (ψυχή); she who clothes the naked stores up treasure for herself.[166]

6.14: The entire value of virginity (παρθενεία) is submission (ὑποταγή) and renunciation (ἀποταγή) and abstinence.[167] A woman who seeks after food is unworthy of Christ, and bread does not satisfy her entirely.

6.15: The seal (σφραγίς) of virtue is fasting (νηστεία); whoever has an abundance of nourishment (τροφή) has an abundance of weakness.

6.16: Stay away from any virgin (παρθένος) of the Lord, and do not look upon a married woman, so that you are not judged (κρίνειν) sacrilegious.[168]

---

[165] So TB. Cf. P: "… whilst boasting of her profession, saying of herself 'I am a virgin.'"

[166] So TB. Cf. P: "The storehouse of virginity is in the life of the soul, in that she clothes the naked." Neither text is convincing, but it is hard to determine what the original readings of the underlying texts might have been. A convincing reading might result from combining the two: "The storehouse of virginity is in the life of the soul; she who clothes the naked stores up treasure for herself." θησαυρός may have stood in the first clause, translated as "storehouse" by the translator of P, and garbled in transmission in T and B.

[167] So T. B reads "love (ἀγάπη) and abstinence" whereas P reads "*apouaktikē* (perhaps a corrupt form of ἀποταγή) and abstinence." *Agapē* is probably to be taken as a misreading of ἀποταγή, which implies that this word certainly stood in the original; the place of *hypotagē*, given its absence in both B and P, is less certain.

[168] TB. This sentence is absent in P, and in view of 7.6 below, and in view of its setting amidst instructions to virgins and *monachai*, we may wonder whether it is a misplaced doublet in TB.

6.17: ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲛⲁⲭⲏ ⲉⲥⲙⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲉⲉⲣⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲛⲁⲭⲏ ⲁⲛ ⲧⲉ. ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲉⲧⲙⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲁⲥ ⲉⲥϩⲛ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲩⲡⲟⲣⲛⲓⲁ.

7.1: ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲩⲡⲟⲣⲛⲉⲩⲉ ⲉⲟⲩⲛⲧⲏ ⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲟⲩⲁⲧⲱⲁⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲩϩⲁⲧⲃⲱϩⲣⲉ ⲡⲉ.

7.2: ⲙⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲉ ⲛⲁⲁⲛⲉⲭⲉ ⲉⲭⲉ ⲛⲉⲩⲥⲣⲟⲥ ⲉⲭⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲡⲉⲧⲣⲁ.[169] ⲩⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲍⲉ ⲛ̄ⲩ ⲛⲁⲣⲱⲧ ⲁⲛ ⲛⲁⲩ. ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲟⲛ[170] ⲙ̄ⲙⲛ ⲥⲁⲃⲉ ⲛⲁϯ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲩⲥⲡⲉⲣⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ϩⲉⲛⲡⲟⲣⲛⲏ. ⲍⲉ ⲛ̄ⲩⲛⲁⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲛ ⲕⲁⲛ ⲉⲩⲱⲁⲛⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲡⲥⲁϩⲟⲩ.[171]

7.3: ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲁⲑⲏⲧ[172] ϯⲥⲟ ⲉϯ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲩⲱⲧⲏⲛ ⲛ̄ϩⲉⲛⲡⲟⲣⲛⲏ ⲫⲁϥϯ ⲛⲁⲩ[173] ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲩⲥⲡⲉⲣⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲧⲁⲉⲓⲛⲩ. ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉⲧⲧⲁⲉⲓⲛⲩ[174] ϩⲛ̄ ⲡⲉⲃⲣⲱⲟⲩ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ. ⲡⲉⲃⲣⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲡⲉ.[175] ⲡⲁⲑⲏⲧ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟϥ ⲥⲛⲁ ⲛ̄ⲁϩⲣⲁϥ.

---

[169] So T, though a half line has been effaced. Cf. B: ⲙⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲉ ⲛⲁⲁⲡⲓϫⲉ ⲉϫⲉ ⲡⲉϥⲥⲟⲩⲟ ⲉϫⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲡⲉⲧⲣⲁ, P ⲙⲛ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲟⲩⲁ (possibly a scribal error for ⲙⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲉ) ⲛⲁⲁⲡⲓϫⲉ ⲉϫⲟⲛ ⲡⲉϥⲃⲣⲟⲥ ⲉϫⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲡⲉⲧⲣⲁ. Whereas the meaning is clear, the precise text is not ascertainable, though only the defacement to T would lead one to doubt the text found there.

[170] ⲟⲛ supplied from B, P. Om. T.

[171] So principally following P supported by B. T is slightly distinct though there is no difference in meaning.

[172] So BP. T: ⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲃⲉ, though in the hand of a corrector. Revillout makes the correction in his edition, with reference to B.

[173] ⲛ̄ϩⲉⲛⲡⲟⲣⲛⲏ ⲫⲁϥϯ ⲛⲁⲩ (so plural) T. Cf. BP: ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲡⲟⲣⲛⲏ ⲫⲁϥϯ ⲛⲁⲥ (sing.)

[174] Supplied from BP. Om. T. Again Revillout alters the text of T.

[175] ⲡⲉⲃⲣⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲡⲉ BP, om. T (with Revillout making the alteration). See the note to the translation for this entire passage, which reads in T: ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲃⲉ ϯⲥⲟ ⲉϯ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲩⲱⲧⲏⲛ ⲛ̄ϩⲉⲛⲡⲟⲣⲛⲏ ⲫⲁϥϯ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲩⲥⲡⲉⲣⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲧⲁⲉⲓⲛⲩ ϩⲛ̄ ⲡⲉⲃⲣⲱⲟⲩ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ.

6.17: A *monachē* who promenades at midday is no *monachē*; and if she walks on her own she is coming close to fornication (πορνεία).

7.1: A man (δέ) who fornicates (πορνεύειν), whilst having a wife, is worthless, and an infanticide.

7.2: Any farmer will avoid (ἀνέχειν) sowing his seed onto stone (πέτρα),[176] for he knows that it will not grow on it. Nor (οὐδέ) likewise does a wise man give of his seed (σπέρμα) to prostitutes (πορνή); for (γάρ) it will produce nothing, and if indeed (κἄν) it does produce something it will produce a curse.

7.3: The foolish man guards against giving his clothing to prostitutes (πορνή), yet is accustomed to give them his precious seed (σπέρμα), one precious above any seed, the seed of a man.[177] But (δέ) the foolish man holds it in disregard.

[176] So T, although a half line has been rubbed out. B and P, whilst distinct, are close. "Any farmer will avoid sowing his wheat onto stone" (B) and "Anyone will avoid sowing his seed onto stone." (P).

[177] So BP, except that "prostitutes" is given in the singular in these versions (whereas T has a plural, as here). T is distinct, though heavily marked by corrections, which Revillout suspects, and so gives the text of B in his edition, which is nonetheless based on T. T, however, is transcribed intact by Rossi. If T is followed the passage would read: "A wise man guards against giving his clothing to prostitutes, so would he give them his seed, precious above all seeds?" Revillout, in a footnote to his translation of T suggests that what lay behind this passage originally was a statement like "A wise man is careful not to give of his seed to prostitutes, but gives his precious seed solely for procreation." This is feasible, in view of the earlier discussion of farmers not sowing on stone, but there is no textual basis. As it is, it is hard to judge between the texts as given.

7.4: ϣϣε ϵϲⲁⲁⲛⲥ̄ ⲛϵⲕϣⲛρϵ ⲕⲁⲗⲱⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ϣϣε ϵ†ⲥⲟ ϵⲡϵⲕⲥⲡⲉⲣⲙⲁ.[178]

7.5: †ⲥⲟ ϵρⲟⲕ ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲁⲕ ⲱ ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲓ̄†ⲥⲟ ϵⲡϵⲕϣⲛρϵ.[179]

7.6: ⲱ ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲥⲁϩⲱⲱⲕ ϩⲁⲃⲁⲗ ⲛⲟⲩⲥ̄ϩⲓⲙⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲣⲑϵⲛⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲃⲱϣⲧ̄ ⲛⲥⲁ ⲧⲉ ⲧⲉⲩⲉⲛ ⲧⲥϩⲁⲓ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ. ϫⲉⲛ ⲛⲉⲩ†ϩⲁⲡ ϵρⲟⲕ ⲕⲁⲕⲱⲥ.[180]

7.7: ⲡⲉⲧϩⲙⲟⲟⲥ ⲙⲛ̄ ϩⲓⲙⲉ ⲁϩⲣⲟϥ ϥⲃⲱϣⲧ̄ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁ ⲕⲉⲟⲩⲉⲓ.[181] ϵⲣϣⲁⲛ ⲟⲩⲁ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲃⲱϣⲧ ⲉⲙⲛ̄ⲧϥϩⲓⲙⲉ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲡⲉϥⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲕⲛⲃ ⲙⲁⲗⲓⲥⲧⲁ ⲡⲉⲧϥϩⲙⲟⲟⲥ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲟⲩϩⲓⲙⲉ.[182] ϵϥⲧⲁⲙⲟ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲧⲣⲉϥⲃⲱϣⲧ̄ ϫⲉ ⲟⲩⲡⲟⲣⲛⲟⲥ ⲡⲉ.[183] ϥⲥⲛϩ ⲅⲁⲣ ϫⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲡⲟⲣⲛⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲕⲗⲏⲣⲟⲛⲟⲙⲉⲓ ⲛⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧ̄ⲣⲣⲟ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ.[184]

7.8: ϣϣε ϵρⲟⲕ ϵⲙⲉⲣⲉ ⲧⲉⲕⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲛ ϩⲱ ϵρⲟⲕ ϵρⲟⲥ.[185] ϵⲥⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ[186] ⲛⲛⲉϩⲓⲁⲙⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ.

---

[178] So TB. P, whilst almost identical in meaning, differs slightly in reading ϣϣε ϵρⲟⲕ ϵⲥⲁⲁⲛⲥ̄ ⲛϵⲕϣⲛρϵ ⲕⲁⲗⲱⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ϵ†ⲥⲟ ϵⲡϵⲕⲥⲡ(ϵ)ⲣⲛⲁ.

[179] So T. Om. P. B: †ⲥⲟ ϵρⲟⲕ ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲁⲕ ⲱ ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲓ̄†ⲥⲟ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ϩⲁϩⲙⲉⲕ.

[180] So P. Om. TB.

[181] So T, and B (though reading ⲕⲉϩⲓⲙⲉ instead of ⲕⲉⲟⲩⲉⲓ.) Cf. P: ⲡⲉⲧϩⲙⲟⲟⲥ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲛϩⲓⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ϣⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲣⲙⲟⲟⲥ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲕⲉⲟⲩⲉⲓ. TB seems to make the better sense.

[182] So TBP with minor variations.

[183] So TB; om. P.

[184] So P, cf. TB: ⲙⲛ̄ ⲡⲟⲣⲛⲟⲥ ⲃⲉ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ⲛⲁⲕⲗⲏⲣⲟⲛⲟⲙⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧ̄ⲉⲣⲟ ⲙ̄ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲩⲉ.

[185] So P. Cf. TB: ϩⲱ ϵρⲟⲕ ⲉⲧⲉⲕⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ.

[186] ⲅⲁⲣ BP: om. T.

7.4: It is fitting to nourish your children well (καλῶς) and it is fitting to be sparing with your seed (σπέρμα).[187]

7.5: Be sparing with yourself alone, man, and do not be sparing with your children.[188]

7.6: Man, keep your distance from (married?) women and girls (παρθένος) and withdraw your gaze from their husbands, so that they do not judge you ill (κακῶς).[189]

7.7: Why would a man, married to a woman, look upon another?[190] For if a man who is unmarried sins twice over in looking upon a woman, this is especially so (μάλιστα) of one who is married.[191] He is demonstrating, through so looking, that he is a fornicator (πόρνος).[192] For (γάρ) it is written: "A fornicator (πόρνος) will not inherit (κληρονομεῖν) the Kingdom of God."[193]

7.8: It is right that you should love your wife and be content with her.[194] For (γάρ) she is like all other women.

---

[187] So TB. P, whilst almost identical in meaning, differs slightly in reading "It is fitting for you to nourish your children well and to be sparing with your seed."

[188] So T. Om. P. B: Be sparing with yourself alone, man, and do not (sic) be sparing with polluting yourself.

[189] So P. Om. TB.

[190] So T, and B (though reading "another woman" instead of simply "another.") Cf. P: "It is improper that anyone who is married to a wife should marry another." TB seems to make the better sense.

[191] So TBP with minor variations.

[192] So TB. Om. P.

[193] So P, cf. TB: "A fornicator, it is said, shall not inherit the Kingdom of Heaven." Cf. I Cor. 6:9–10.

[194] So P, Cf. TB: "Be content with your wife."

7.9: ⲡⲉⲧⲥⲉⲉⲧ ⲙ̄ⲙ ⲧⲉⲩⲥⲣⲓⲙⲉ[195] ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲁⲥ ⲩⲛⲁⲉⲙⲧⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲣⲏⲧ ⲉⲭⲱⲥ.[196] ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ̄ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲥⲱⲱⲧ̄ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲥ ⲣⲱⲱⲥ.[197]

7.10: ⲣⲙ̄ ⲡⲱⲓ ⲉⲧⲕⲛⲁⲱⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲱⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲕ.[198]

7.11: ⲡⲉⲧⲥⲉⲉⲧ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲩⲥⲣⲓⲙⲉ ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲱⲁⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲅⲁⲙⲟⲥ ⲩⲛⲁⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲉⲛⲱⲏⲣⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲃⲉ. ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲧⲃ̄ⲃⲟ ⲣⲙ̄ ⲛⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ[199] ⲛ̄ⲥⲩⲛⲁⲅⲉ ⲛⲉⲩⲱⲏⲣⲉ ⲛⲁⲱⲙ̄ⲙⲱⲉ ⲛⲁⲩ.[200]

7.12: ⲡⲉⲧ ⲱⲙ̄ⲙⲱⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲣⲙ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲉ ⲛⲉⲩⲱⲏⲣⲉ ⲛⲁⲱⲙ̄ⲙⲱⲉ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲣⲙ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲉ.[201]

7.13: ⲙ̄ⲙ ⲟⲩⲙ̄ⲧⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲣⲏⲧ ⲱⲟⲟⲡ ⲡⲱⲛⲣ̄ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲙ̄ⲑⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲟⲩⲛⲧⲣ̄ ⲣⲉⲛⲱⲏⲣⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲃⲉ ⲉⲩⲟⲩⲟⲭ ⲉⲱⲱⲛⲉ ⲉⲩⲟⲛⲭⲱⲱⲣⲉ.[202] ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲣⲣⲙ̄ⲣⲁⲗ ⲇⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲣⲙ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲉ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲧⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲩ.

---

[195] ⲧⲉⲩⲥⲣⲓⲙⲉ BP; T: ⲟⲩⲥⲣⲓⲙⲉ.

[196] ⲉⲭⲱⲥ T. B: ⲉⲣⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲭⲱⲥ. P: ⲉⲭⲛ̄ ⲡⲉⲩⲱⲏⲣⲉ ⲕⲁⲗⲱⲥ. Possibly the reading of P should be preferred, and that of T explained as the omission of the letters between the initial ⲉⲭ and the final ⲱⲥ.

[197] ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ̄ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲥⲱⲱⲧ̄ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲥ ⲣⲱⲱⲥ B. T: ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ̄ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲥⲱⲱⲧ̄ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲥ ⲣⲱⲱⲥ. P: ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ̄ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲥⲱⲱⲧ̄ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁ ⲧⲉⲩⲥⲣⲓⲙⲉ ⲣⲱⲱϥ.

[198] So T. B: ⲣⲙ̄ ⲡⲱⲓ ⲉⲧⲕⲛⲁⲱⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲱⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲛ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲣⲱⲱⲕ. P: ⲡⲱⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛⲁⲱⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲱⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ ⲛⲁϥ ⲣⲱⲱϥ.

[199] ⲛⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ T. B: ⲙ̄ⲙⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ, P: ⲙ̄ⲙⲉϥⲣⲟⲟⲩ.

[200] So TB. P has minor differences which do not impinge upon meaning.

[201] So TB. P, however, adds ⲣⲙ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲉ to the preceding ⲛⲁⲱⲙ̄ⲙⲱⲉ ⲛⲁⲩ and goes on: ⲛⲑⲉ ⲙ̄ⲧⲁϥ ⲱⲙ̄ⲙⲱⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲣⲙ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲉ. As suggested in the note to the translation, the reading of P can be explained as a misreading of a text like that of TB.

[202] ⲉⲩⲟⲩⲟⲭ ⲉⲱⲱⲛⲉ ⲉⲩⲟⲛⲭⲱⲱⲣⲉ T. P: ⲛ̄ⲭⲱⲣⲉ ⲉⲩⲟⲩⲟⲭ ⲉⲱⲱⲛⲉ. Cf. B: ⲉⲩⲉⲟⲩⲟⲭ ⲉⲱⲱⲛⲉ ⲉⲩⲟⲩⲟⲭ ⲉⲩⲟ ⲛ̄ⲭⲱⲱⲣⲉ.

7.9: He who stays with his wife[203] alone shall enjoy peaceableness with her,[204] and the one who looks on her alone.[205]

7.10: With the measure with which you measure it will be measured out for you.[206]

7.11: He who lives with his wife in accordance with (κατά) the purpose of marriage (γάμος) will see wise children, and whoever remains chaste at the times of divine service (?) (συναγή) will be honoured by his children.

7.12: Whoever honours the Lord in truth, so will his sons honour him in truth.[207]

7.13: There is no better relief in life for the heart of a man than the possession of wise sons, free of illness and strong.[208] They will be granted to whomsoever is a servant of the Lord in truth.

---

[203] So BP. T reads "a wife."

[204] So T. B is of the same meaning, whilst slightly different in expression, whereas P reads "he shall enjoy peace contentedly (καλῶς) with his children." Whereas TB would seem to make more sense, the reading of P may be preferred on the basis that the reading of TB may be seen as a corruption of that of P.

[205] So TB. Cf. P: "and the one who looks on his wife alone."

[206] Matt. 7:2 and par. Cf. also 15.10 below, where the text is cited again. The different mss cite this saying in different ways. P is particularly distinct: "for the measure which a man measures, so it will be measured out for him, himself."

[207] So TB. Cf. P: "…whoever remains chaste at the times of his *sunagē* will be honoured by his children in truth, just as he himself honours the Lord in truth." It is hard to determine which the correct version. The text of P may result from a misreading of a version or Greek *Vorlage* of TB, with the resultant omission of material, but TB may likewise have expanded the original text.

[208] So T. P: "strong and free of illness."

7.14: ⲧⲉⲡ ⲛⲉⲕⲱⲛⲣⲉ ⲉⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲣⲏ̅ ⲙⲁ̅ⲥⲱ ⲁⲛ.[209]

7.15: ⲧⲥⲁⲃⲟⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲧⲟⲓⲛⲥⲱⲧⲙ̅ ⲣⲏ̅ ⲟⲩⲕⲁⲣⲱϥ. ⲁⲩⲱ ⲣⲏ̅ ⲡⲉⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲱ ⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲕⲙⲛ̅ⲧ̅ⲣ̅ⲗⲗⲟ ⲥⲉⲛⲁ̅ⲥⲗⲥⲱⲗⲕ̅ ⲣⲏ̅ ⲛ̅ⲱⲁϫⲉ ⲙ̅ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ.

7.16: ⲉⲣⲑ[210] ⲛ̅ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲣ̅ⲣ̅ⲗⲗⲟ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲧⲙⲉ. ⲧⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲱⲁⲣⲁⲉⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ[211] ⲉⲥⲱⲟⲟⲡ ⲛ̅ⲛ̅ⲣⲉⲭⲓⲥⲟⲗ.[212] ⲟⲩⲱⲡⲛⲣⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲃⲓⲟⲥ ⲛ̅ⲛⲁⲧⲉϯⲥⲛ̅ⲱⲉ ⲛ̅ⲣⲟⲙⲡⲉ ϫⲉ ⲙ̅ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲛ̅ ⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲛ̅ⲥⲱⲟⲩ.[213] ⲧⲁⲓ ⲧⲉ ⲑⲉ ⲙ̅ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲛⲁ̅ⲣⲁⲧⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲉⲩⲛⲁ̅ⲣ ⲟⲩⲛⲟⲥ ⲛ̅ⲁⲉⲉ.[214]

---

[209] ...ⲣⲏ̅ ⲟⲩⲙⲉ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲧⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁϥ. ⲧⲉⲡ ⲛⲉⲕⲱⲛⲣⲉ ⲉⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲣⲏ̅ ⲛⲁ̅ⲥⲱ ⲁⲛ. So TB. Cf. P: ...ⲣⲏ̅ ⲟⲩⲙⲉ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲧⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲥ. ⲧⲁⲁⲡ ⲛⲉⲕⲱⲛⲣⲉ ⲉⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ̅ⲙⲁ̅ⲥⲉ ⲏⲣⲡ ⲁⲛ.

[210] ⲉⲣⲑ T. B: ⲉⲣ . P: ⲉⲛⲱⲁⲣⲉ.

[211] ⲅⲁⲣ TP. B: ⲇⲉ.

[212] ⲛ̅ⲛ̅ⲣⲉⲭⲓⲥⲟⲗ T. B: ⲡⲥⲟⲗ. P: ⲛ̅ⲣⲉⲭⲓⲟⲩⲁ.

[213] So B. T is slightly defective, but what is readable supports B. Cf P: ⲟⲩⲱⲡⲛⲣⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲃⲓⲟⲥ ⲛⲉⲛ ⲧⲁⲩⲣ̅ⲱⲟⲛⲧⲉⲙ̅ⲙⲉ ⲛⲣⲟⲙⲡⲉ ϫⲉ ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲛ ⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲉⲩⲭⲓ ⲉⲣⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̅ⲧⲁⲩ. Beyond the differences of expression, the distinct number of years is notable.

[214] So TB. Cf. P: ⲧⲩⲟⲛⲧⲉⲟⲉ ⲙⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲛⲁ̅ⲣⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲣⲏ̅ ⲛⲉⲓⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲱ ⲇⲉ ⲣⲱⲟⲩ ⲟⲛ ⲩⲛⲁⲱⲱⲡ ⲉⲛⲱⲁⲣⲁⲉⲉ. See the comment on the translation.

7.14: Accustom your son to the church (ἐκκλησία), and not to take pleasure in drinking-places.[215]

7.15: Teach him to learn in silence, and in the time of your old age he will comfort you with the words of God.

7.16: There are men who obtain[216] old age in the truth, for (γάρ)[217] the lifespan of liars[218] is brief. It is a wonder if somebody's life (βίος) were nine-hundred years of age because they are found not to sin at all.[219] Those people who commit no sin receive length of days.[220]

---

[215] "He will grant this to whomsoever is a servant of the Lord in truth. Accustom your son to the church, and not to affection for a drinking-place." So TB. Cf. P: "To whomsoever is a servant of the Lord in truth will he grant that you might accustom your son to the church and not to a place of drinking wine." This latter construction is, however, rather awkward.

[216] So TB (though B has a copyist's error.) P: "He pledges to men…"

[217] For: so TP. B: "yet" (δέ).

[218] "Liars" T. B: "The falsehood". P: "Blasphemers."

[219] So B. T is slightly defective, but what is readable supports B. Cf P: "For (γάρ) it is a wonder when somebody's life (βίος) is three-hundred years because they are are found not to commit sin at all." In particular the difference in the number of years is notable. There is no basis to decide which is the more likely, though the term of nine-hundred puts one in mind of the patriarchal narratives.

[220] So TB. P is utterly distinct: "Any person who sins in these times enjoys no length of life." It is possible that both clauses stood originally, and that each branch of the manuscript tradition has omitted one of them.

8.1: ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲣ̄ⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲧⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲉ. ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲣⲉϥⲭⲓⲥⲟⲗ ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ ⲙⲁϫⲁⲁⲥ.[221]

8.2: ⲙⲛ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲭⲣⲓⲥⲧⲓⲁⲛⲟⲥ ⲛⲁϫⲓⲥⲟⲗ ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲟⲩⲣⲉϥⲭⲓⲥⲟⲗ ⲧⲉ.[222]

8.3: ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉϥⲭⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗϩ̄ ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ[223] ⲙ̄ⲡⲉ$\overline{\text{ⲭⲥ}}$ ⲛ̄ϣϣⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉϫⲓⲥⲟⲗ.[224] ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲟⲩⲙⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲉⲧⲙⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙⲉⲩⲭⲓⲥⲟⲗ.[225]

8.4: ⲟⲩⲱⲡⲛⲣⲉ ⲧⲉ ⲧⲧⲉⲗⲙⲛⲣⲓⲁ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲃⲛⲕ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉϫⲙ̄ ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉ$\overline{\text{ⲭⲥ}}$[226] ⲉⲩⲙⲉϩ ⲛ̄ⲕⲱϩ ϩⲓⲙⲟⲥⲧⲉ.

8.5: ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲙⲁⲓⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲧⲙⲟⲥⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲱⲓⲡⲉ ⲁⲛ ϩⲛⲧϥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉϩⲣⲟⲧⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ϩⲛⲧϥ.[227]

8.6: ⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲙⲟⲥⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲣⲏⲩ ⲙⲟⲥⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲩⲁⲡⲟⲧⲁⲥⲥⲉ ⲛⲁϥ ϫⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲙⲉⲣⲓⲧⲏ̄.

---

[221] So B. Cf. T: ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲣ̄ⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲓ ⲡⲉⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ (which latter Revillout corrects to ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ.) ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲣⲉϥⲭⲓⲥⲟⲗ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲥⲟ ⲛ̄ⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ.

[222] ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲣ̄ⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ... ⲟⲩⲣⲉϥⲭⲓⲥⲟⲗ ⲧⲉ om. P.

[223] ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ TBP. C: ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲙⲛ̄ⲡⲉⲥⲛⲟϥ

[224] So TP. Cf. B: ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉϥⲭⲓⲥⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ϥⲛ̄ⲡϣⲁ ⲁⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉ$\overline{\text{ⲭⲥ}}$. ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ϣϣⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉϫⲓⲥⲟⲗ. The agreement of P and T means that B must result from revision.

[225] ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ... ⲙⲉⲩⲭⲓⲥⲟⲗ TB. Om. P. Cf. C: ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲉⲧⲛⲡ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧⲙⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲙⲉⲩⲭⲓⲥⲟⲗ.

[226] ⲙ̄ⲡⲉ$\overline{\text{ⲭⲥ}}$ TP. ⲙ̄ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ B.

[227] ϩⲛⲧϥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉϩⲣⲟⲧⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ϩⲛⲧϥ. So P. Om. TB.

8.1: Those who love the truth are not ignorant of God. For (γάρ) deception is ignorant of itself.[228]

8.2: No Christian (χριστιανός) should be deceptive, for (γάρ) ignorance is a deception.[229]

8.3: For (γάρ) it is not fitting for a man who is deceptive to participate in the Body (σῶμα)[230] of Christ.[231] For (γάρ) God is truth and those who love God do not deceive. [232]

8.4: What a wonder is the daring (τολμηρός) of those who approach the body (σῶμα) of Christ[233] whilst filled with envy and hatred.

8.5: God is a lover of humanity, and anyone who hates humanity is without shame in his heart for God, nor (οὐδέ) is there any fear in his heart.[234]

8.6: Those who hate one another hate God and reject (ἀποτάσσω) him as they say "Do not love us."

---

[228] So B. Cf. T: "God is not ignorant of those who are ignorant of him. For ignorance is a deception" (or, "deception is ignorance"). In neither clause is it easy to see what the right reading should be and, as noted below, there is no guidance from P which omits the passage altogether. B has been preferred because the second clause of T, albeit with a different expression, repeats the content of the final clause of the passage, present in both.

[229] P omits the whole passage from "Those who love the truth" to "ignorance is a deception."

[230] So TBP. C adds "and the blood."

[231] So TP (and C, with the addition of "and the blood.") Cf. B: "A deceptive man should not approach the Body of Christ, and it is not fitting that he should be a deceiver."

[232] "For God is truth … do not deceive" om. P. However, C contains a version of this saying, which assures us of its inclusion here.

[233] "Of Christ" TP. "Of the Lord" B.

[234] So P. "In his heart for God… in his heart" om. TB.

8.7: ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ[235] ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲙⲟⲥⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲑⲓⲕⲱⲛ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ. ⲡⲉⲧⲣ̄ ⲡⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲩⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲩ.

8.8: ⲙⲛ̄ ⲣⲩⲇⲟⲛⲏ ⲣⲙ̄ ⲡⲡⲁⲑⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲙⲟⲥⲧⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲩⲱⲡⲏⲣⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲍⲉ ⲉⲩ ⲥⲙ̄ⲥⲟⲙ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ ⲧⲏⲣⲛ̄.[236]

8.9: ⲡⲉⲧⲙⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲣⲓⲧⲟⲩⲱⲩ ⲉⲩⲙⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ. ⲡⲉⲧⲙⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛⲁⲙⲉⲣⲓⲧⲏ. ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲙⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ ⲟⲩⲱⲏⲣⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ.

8.10: ⲟⲩⲃⲟⲧⲉ[237] ⲛⲁⲣⲣ̄ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲩⲕⲧⲟ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉ$\overline{\text{ⲭⲥ}}$[238] ⲉⲩⲥⲉⲡⲗⲟⲓⲥⲉ ⲍⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙ̄ⲡⲱⲁ ⲁⲛ. ⲡⲉ ⲧⲉ ⲛⲩⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ ⲁⲛ ⲛⲙ̄ⲡⲱⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ[239] ⲭⲛⲁⲭⲓ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉⲛ ⲛⲟⲥⲛ̄ⲥⲛⲁⲉ.[240]

8.11: ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲣⲏⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲥⲩⲛⲁⲅⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲩ̄ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ ⲉⲡⲱⲱ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ. ⲡⲉⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲩ̄ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ ⲅⲁⲣ[241] ⲉⲡⲱⲱ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲛⲱⲥⲓⲥ ⲛⲁⲡⲟⲥⲧⲟⲗⲟⲥ ⲙⲛ̄ⲡⲉⲩⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲓⲟⲛ[242] ⲉⲩⲥⲱⲃⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁ ⲡⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉ$\overline{\text{ⲭⲥ}}$.[243]

---

[235] P adds ⲅⲁⲣ here.

[236] ⲡⲉⲧⲣ̄ ⲡⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ... ⲧⲏⲣⲛ̄ TB. Om. P.

[237] ⲟⲩⲃⲟⲧⲉ TB. ⲟⲩⲍⲓⲧⲉ P.

[238] ⲉⲩⲕⲧⲟ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉ$\overline{\text{ⲭⲥ}}$ TB. P: ⲉⲩⲡⲛⲧ ⲣⲁⲃⲁⲗ ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲙ̄ⲙⲡⲉⲥⲛⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉ$\overline{\text{ⲭⲥ}}$.

[239] ⲙⲙ̄ⲡⲱⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ TB. P: ⲛⲁⲍⲓⲟⲥ ⲉⲙⲉⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ.

[240] ⲭⲛⲁⲭⲓ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉⲛ ⲛⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲥⲛⲁⲉ T. B: ⲭⲛⲁⲭⲓ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉⲛⲛ̄ⲥⲛⲁⲉ. P: ⲭⲛⲁⲭⲓ ⲛⲣⲛⲥⲁϣ.

[241] ⲅⲁⲣ TB. Om. P.

[242] ⲁⲛⲁⲅⲛⲱⲥⲓⲥ ⲛⲁⲡⲟⲥⲧⲟⲗⲟⲥ ⲙⲛ̄ⲡⲉⲩⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲓⲟⲛ P. ⲁⲛⲁⲅⲛⲱⲥⲓⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲩⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲓⲟⲛ TB.

[243] ⲙ̄ⲡⲉ$\overline{\text{ⲭⲥ}}$ P, om. TB. P moreover employs a different construction, though having the same meaning.

8.7: Woe (οὐαί)[244] to those who hate the image (εἰκών) of God. For (γάρ) anyone who does evil to a human being is doing it to himself.

8.8: There is no pleasure (ἡδονή) in the passion (πάθος) of hatred, and it is strange that it should have power over us all.[245]

8.9: Whoever (δέ) loves his neighbour loves God. And whoever loves God will be loved of God. And whoever God loves is a child of God.

8.10: The man who turns away from the body (σῶμα) of Christ is an abomination before God,[246] making the excuse that he is not worthy. Whoever does not make himself worthy[247] of the mystery (μυστήριον) shall be greatly punished.[248]

8.11: What is the use of attending the gathering (συναγή) and not listening to the scriptures (γραφή)? For (γάρ) whoever does not listen to the reading (ἀνάγνωσις) of the apostle (ἀπόστολος) and the Gospel (εὐαγγέλιον)[249] is making a mockery of the mystery (μυστήριον) of Christ.[250]

---

[244] So TB. P "For woe is…"

[245] "Anyone who does evil … over us all." TB. Om. P.

[246] So TB. Cf. P: "The man who flees from the body and blood of Christ is a tribulation(?) before God."

[247] P, whilst having the same meaning, employs the Greek ἄξιος, whereas TB employ Coptic terminology.

[248] B omits "greatly."

[249] "The reading (ἀνάγνωσις) of the apostle (ἀπόστολος) and the Gospel (εὐαγγέλιον) P. TB: "the reading of the Gospel."

[250] "Mystery of Christ" P. TB: "Mystery".

8.12: ⲡⲉⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ϥⲁⲓⲥⲑⲁⲛⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙ̄ⲧⲁⲩⲑⲉⲛⲧⲏⲥ[251] ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ ⲡⲉⲥⲛⲟϥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉ$\overline{\text{ⲭⲥ}}$[252] ⲙ̄ⲡ̄ⲣ̄ⲧⲣⲉϥⲭⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ϩⲛⲧⲟ̄.[253] ⲡⲉⲧⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ϥⲛⲁ̄ϣⲟⲣⲡ̄ ⲉⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ.[254] [255]

8.13: ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉϥ̄ⲣ̄ϩⲟⲧⲉ ⲛⲁⲗⲩⲡⲉⲓ ⲉⲩϣⲁⲛ ⲥⲗⲏ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉ ϯⲁⲗⲗⲉⲓ ⲉⲙⲡⲁⲧⲟ̄ⲃⲱⲕ ⲉⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ.[256] ⲡⲁⲙⲉⲗⲏⲥ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟϥ ϣⲁϥ̄ⲣ̄ϩⲁⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲉϥⲭⲓ ⲥⲙⲟⲩ.

8.14: ⲡⲉⲧ̄ⲣ̄ϣⲟⲣⲡ̄ ⲉⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ ϥⲛⲁϫⲓ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲥⲙⲟⲩ ⲉϥⲕⲛⲃ. ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁ̄ⲣ̄ϩⲁⲉ ⲇⲉ[257] ⲭⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲁϥ̄ⲣ̄ϩⲁⲉ ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲙⲟⲩ.

8.15: ϣϣⲉ ⲉϫⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗϩ̄ⲙ̄ ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ ⲡⲉⲥⲛⲟϥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉ$\overline{\text{ⲭⲥ}}$ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲥⲙⲟⲧ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲕⲟⲩⲓ ⲉϥⲟⲃⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲱⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉϥⲙⲁⲁⲩ.[258] ⲡⲉⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ϥⲭⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ϩⲛⲧⲟ̄ ⲙ̄ⲙⲧⲟ̄ ⲱⲛϩ̄ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ. ⲡⲉⲧϫⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ ⲉϥϩ̄ⲙ̄ ⲟⲩϫⲱϩϩ̄ⲙ̄ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ ϩ̄ⲙ̄ ⲟⲩⲁⲕⲁⲑⲁⲣⲥⲓⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲣⲛⲉⲓⲁ ϥϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲡⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲡⲉϥⲭⲓⲧⲟ̄.[259]

9.1: ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ ⲛⲟⲃⲉ ϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲁϩ̄ⲣ̄ⲙ̄ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲙⲟⲥⲧⲉ. ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲅⲁⲣ ϩ̄ⲙ̄ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲉⲩⲁⲣⲉϩⲱⲧⲃ̄ ϣⲱⲡⲉ.

---

[251] ⲡⲉⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ϥⲁⲓⲥⲑⲁⲛⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙ̄ⲧⲁⲩⲑⲉⲛⲧⲏⲥ TB. P: ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲛϥⲛⲟⲓ ⲛⲓⲙⲧⲙⲙⲧⲭⲱⲱⲣⲉ.

[252] ⲙ̄ⲡⲉ$\overline{\text{ⲭⲥ}}$ TP. B: ⲙ̄ⲡⲉ$\overline{\text{ⲭⲥ}}$ ⲓⲥ.

[253] ⲙ̄ⲡ̄ⲣ̄ⲧⲣⲉϥⲭⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ϩⲛⲧⲟ̄ TP. B: ⲙ̄ⲡ̄ⲣ̄ⲧⲣⲉϥⲭⲓⲧⲟ̄.

[254] ⲡⲉⲧ ⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ϥⲛⲁ̄ϣⲟⲣⲡ̄ ⲉⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ TB. P: ⲡⲉⲧ ⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲉ ⲇⲉ ϩⲱⲱ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ϩ̄ⲙ̄ ⲡϩⲛⲧ ⲧⲏⲣⲟ̄ ϥⲛⲁ̄ϣⲟⲣⲡ̄ ⲛⲱⲁⲣⲡϥ ⲉⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ.

[255] P concludes here.

[256] So T. Cf. B: ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉϥ̄ⲣ̄ϩⲟⲧⲉ ⲛⲁⲗⲩⲡⲉⲓ ⲉⲩϣⲁⲛϯⲁⲗⲗⲉⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲧⲉϥⲃⲱⲕ.

[257] ⲇⲉ B, om. T.

[258] ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲱⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉϥⲙⲁⲁⲩ are in a secondary hand in T, which has been corrected with the erasure of two words. The inclusion of these words is, however, supported by B.

[259] So B. T is damaged here. ⲉⲡⲉⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙ̄ⲧⲟ̄ ⲉⲡⲉⲧⲉⲛ may be read, followed after a gap by ⲭⲓ. This led Revillout to translate "mieux vaudrait pour lui n'avoir pas la vie…" A line has been erased and illegible corrections made.

8.12: Whoever does not observe (αἰσθάνειν) the power (αὐθεντία)[260] of the body (σῶμα) and the blood of Christ[261] shall not receive in his heart,[262] but (δέ) whoever believes (πιστεύειν) in it shall hurry to the church (ἐκκλησία.)[263] [264]

8.13: For (γάρ) the devout man is grieved (λυπεῖν) if there is prayer or singing (ψάλλειν) before he arrives at church (ἐκκλησία).[265] However (δέ) the careless (ἀμελής) one is usually last and receives no blessing.

8.14: Anyone who hurries to church receives a double blessing; anyone who is late except of (χωρίς) necessity (ἀνάγκη) is too late to be blessed.

8.15: It is right to receive the body (σῶμα) and the blood of Christ as a little child thirsts for his mother's milk. For (γάρ) whoever does not receive it in his heart has no life in him. However (δέ) whoever receives it whilst polluted by hatred or by the impurity (ἀκαθαρσία) of fornication (πορνεία) does evil in receiving.[266]

9.1: There is no sin as bad in the sight of God as hatred; for from this murder comes about.

---

[260] Rather than using these Greek words, P employs Coptic words. Rossi, 88, rather oddly translates the word as "sacrificio."

[261] "Of Christ" TP. B: "… of Jesus Christ."

[262] So TP. B: "… shall not receive it.

[263] So TB. Cf. P: "but whoever believes, on the other hand, with all his heart, shall hurry to be early in the church."

[264] P breaks off here.

[265] So T. Cf. B: "For the devout man is grieved if there is singing before he arrives."

[266] "… does evil in receiving" renders B. See the apparatus for T.

9.2: ⲡⲉⲧⲙⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲣⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲣⲁ ⲫⲩⲥⲓⲛ ⲡⲥⲟⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲙⲟⲥⲧⲉ.[267]

9.3: ⲱⲁⲣⲉ ⲧⲁⲅⲁⲡⲏ ⲉⲓⲱ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ. ⲡⲙⲟⲥⲧⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲣⲱⲱⲕ ⲱⲁⲭⲟⲟⲣ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲣⲉⲧⲉ.[268]

9.4: ⲉⲣⲉ ⲧⲁⲅⲁⲡⲏ ⲡⲣⲉⲡⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲭⲣⲉⲓⲥⲧⲓⲁⲛⲟⲥ. ⲡⲉⲧⲭⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉ$\overline{\text{χc}}$ ⲱⲱⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ ⲉⲭⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲕⲕⲉⲟⲩⲱⲱ.

9.5: ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲧⲁⲅⲁⲡⲏ ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲙⲁⲁⲩ. ⲧⲁⲅⲁⲡⲏ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲛ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ.

9.6: ⲡⲭⲱⲕ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲅⲁⲡⲏ ⲡⲉ ⲣ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲕ ⲛ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ. ⲡⲉⲧⲣ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲕ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲩⲙⲟⲥⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲕ ⲕⲛⲁⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲱⲛⲧ̄ ⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ. ⲙⲛ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲙⲛ̄ⲁⲅⲁⲡⲏ ⲛ̄ⲣⲛⲧⲧ̄ ⲛⲁⲭⲓⲃⲉⲕⲉ.[269]

9.7: ⲡⲉⲧⲣ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲕ ⲇⲉ[270] ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲕⲭⲁⲭⲉ ⲕⲛⲁⲭⲓ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲕⲗⲟⲙ ⲛ̄ⲁⲧⲣⲱⲟⲃ̄.

9.8: ⲛ̄ⲁⲱⲛ̄ⲣⲉ ⲛ̄ⲕⲛⲁⲣ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲕ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛ̄ⲥⲓ ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲕⲭⲁⲭⲉ. ⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲕ ⲇⲉ ⲱⲟⲟⲡ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲧⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲣⲛ̄ ⲣⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲭⲣⲏⲙⲁ. ⲡⲣⲉⲕⲣ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲕ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲱⲁⲭⲱⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲣⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲁⲡⲟⲧ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩⲛ̄ⲱⲣⲡ̄ ⲙⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲕ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲧ.[271]

9.9: ⲟⲩⲱⲓⲡⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲭⲣⲉⲓⲥⲧⲓⲁⲛⲟⲥ ⲉⲩⲛⲧⲧ̄ ⲱⲧⲏⲛ ⲥⲛ̄ⲧⲉ[272] ⲉⲕⲱⲃⲡ̄ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲕ ⲉⲡⲉⲧⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲕ.

9.10: ⲉⲱⲭⲉ ⲣⲙ̄ ⲡⲱⲛⲣ̄ ⲧⲛ̄ ⲕⲟⲓⲛⲱⲛⲓ ⲙⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲣⲏⲩ ⲡⲟⲥⲱ ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲛⲉⲧⲛⲁⲧⲁⲕⲟ.

---

[267] ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲙⲟⲥⲧⲉ conj. T: ⲡⲉⲧⲙⲟⲥⲧⲉ, B: ⲙ̄ⲡⲙⲟⲥⲧⲉ.

[268] ⲱⲁⲣⲉ ... ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲣⲉⲧⲉ. So TB. T is corrected through erasure, and ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲣⲉⲧⲉ is found in a secondary hand in the middle of an erased line, but the line nonetheless makes sense and is supported by B.

[269] ⲛ̄ⲣⲛⲧⲧ̄ ⲛⲁⲭⲓⲃⲉⲕⲉ supplied from B. T is lacunose.

[270] ⲇⲉ B, om. T.

[271] ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲧ T, om. B.

[272] B concludes here.

9.2: Whoever goes on the path of sin, contrary to (παρά) nature (φύσις), is a brother of anyone who hates.

9.3: Love (ἀγάπη) washes every sin away,[273] but (δέ) hate, on the other hand, undoes virtue (ἀρετή).

9.4: Love (ἀγάπη) is fitting (πρεπεῖν) for those who are Christians (χριστιανός), for (γάρ) whoever receives Christ should also receive his will.

9.5: Love (ἀγάπη) does not have acquaintance, for love acknowledges all people.

9.6: The goal of love (ἀγάπη) is to do good to all people. Anyone who does good to one who hates him will be like God. Anyone with no love (ἀγάπη) in his heart will receive no reward.

9.7: Anyone who does good to his enemies shall receive a crown which will not fade.

9.8: When somebody does good to his enemy, how shall he not do good to all? Yet (δέ) good is not done simply through extensive almsgiving (χρῆμα), for (γάρ) good may be done entirely through a cup of cold water or a single[274] loaf.

9.9: It is shameful that a Christian (χριστιανός) who has two garments[275] should be neglectful of somebody who has none.

9.10: If we have communion (κοινωνία) with one another in life, how much more so (πόσῳ μᾶλλον) in death.

---

[273] Cf. Proverbs 10:12.
[274] "Single" T. Om. B.
[275] B concludes here.

9.11: ⲁⲣⲓⲙⲁⲓⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲛⲥⲓⲡⲱ̄ⲙⲙⲟ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲧⲏⲣⲛ̄.

9.12: ⲙ̄ⲛ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲉ[276] ⲥⲙ̄ ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲥⲛ̄ ⲧⲕⲟⲗⲁⲥⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲅⲁⲡⲏ.

9.13: ⲁⲣⲓⲙⲁⲓⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲥⲉⲱⲥ ⲉⲕⲱⲟⲟⲡ. ⲛ̄ⲅⲛⲱⲥⲕ̄ ⲁⲛ.

9.14: ⲟⲩⲏⲣ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲉⲕⲁⲥⲉ ⲥⲓⲭⲙ̄ ⲡⲕⲁⲥ. ⲛⲉⲕⲭⲟ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲥⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲡⲉⲧⲱⲟⲩⲉⲓⲧ. ⲟⲩⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲥⲟⲟⲩ ⲥⲟⲧⲡ̄ ⲛⲁⲥⲣⲙ̄ ⲡⲥⲟⲫⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲱⲁⲩⲣⲁⲱⲉ ⲉⲭⲙ̄ ⲡⲥⲏⲩ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲥⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲧ. ⲡⲁⲑⲏⲧ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲩ ⲱⲁⲩⲭⲉ ⲡⲉⲩⲁⲥⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲥⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲥⲟⲟⲩ ⲙⲛ̄ⲡⲥⲱⲥ ⲱⲁⲩⲱⲭⲛ̄ ⲙⲉⲩⲃⲉⲛ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲥⲛ̄ ⲡⲉⲩⲃⲓⲭ.

9.15: ⲟⲩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲃⲉ ⲛⲁϯⲥⲟ ⲉⲭⲟⲟⲥ ⲭⲉ ⲡⲥⲟⲭ. ⲛⲁⲑⲏⲧ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲩ ⲱⲁⲩⲧⲁⲩⲉ ⲥⲱⲱ[277] ⲛⲓⲙ.

9.16: ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲕⲣⲓⲛⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲥⲁ ⲛ̄ⲱⲁⲭⲉ ⲛ̄ⲣⲱⲩ. ⲛ̄ⲥⲉ ⲛⲁⲣ̄ⲡⲱⲃⲱ̄ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲛ̄ⲕⲉ ⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲩⲥⲏⲧ.

[276] ⲛⲁⲛⲉ conj. Rossi. T is damaged.

[277] T is unclear. Rossi reads ⲥⲱⲱ, indicating the ⲱ as conjectural; cf. Revillout ⲥⲱⲃ.

9.11: Be loving to people, for (γάρ) we are all pilgrims.

9.12: There is nothing which will save a person from chastisement (κόλασις) like love (ἀγάπη).

9.13: Be loving to people while (ἕως) you live; you are not here for long.

9.14: How long is life on the earth? Do not spend it in vanity. For the wise (σοφός) there is a better day, and he rejoices in the utility of every day. However (δέ) the foolish lets his life run away each day, and when destruction comes he has nothing in his hand.

9.15: The man who is wise avoids saying any word of abuse, whereas (δέ) the foolish utters all kinds of calumny.[278]

9.16: A man is to be judged (κρίνειν) by the words of his mouth; the thoughts of his heart will likewise not be forgotten.

[278] Here following Rossi's reading of T. Were Revillout to be followed, the phrase would be rendered: "… whereas (δέ) the foolish utters all kinds of things."

10.1: ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲱⲃⲱ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ ⲉⲣⲟⲩ ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲩ. ⲁⲩⲧⲁⲁⲥ [ ][279] ⲛⲁⲕ ⲥⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲕⲡⲣⲁⲍⲓⲥ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲕ[ⲣ̄]ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ.[280] ⲧⲉⲕⲁⲙⲉⲗⲓⲁ ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲁⲥ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲱⲛⲏ̄ ⲉⲡⲇⲁⲓⲙⲱⲛ. ⲕⲁⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩⲣ̄ⲧⲉⲓⲥⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲧⲉⲩⲁⲙⲉⲗⲓⲁ.

10.2: ⲟⲩⲁⲙⲉⲗⲏⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲭⲥⲉ ⲉⲥⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲡⲧⲁⲕⲟ. ⲡⲉⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲩⲓⲣⲟⲟⲩⲱ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲁⲛ ⲥⲁ ⲡⲉⲩⲟⲩⲭⲁⲓ ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲁⲩ[281] ⲛⲓⲙ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲧⲁⲛⲥⲟⲩⲧⲏ̄.

10.3: ⲡⲉⲧⲩⲓⲣⲟⲟⲩⲱ ⲥⲁ ⲡⲉⲩⲟⲩⲭⲁⲓ ⲣ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲏ ⲛ̄ⲣⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲥⲓⲣⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲣⲟ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲩⲣ̄ⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲛⲁⲟⲱⲟⲩ.

10.4: ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲛ̄ⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲡⲉⲛⲁⲅⲛⲱⲥⲓⲥ ⲟⲩⲧ̄ⲃⲛⲏ ⲡⲉ. ⲡⲉⲧϯ ⲛ̄ⲣⲧⲏⲩ ⲉⲡⲱⲱ ⲛ̄ⲩⲛⲁⲣ̄ⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲁⲛ.

10.5: ⲡⲉⲧⲙⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲱⲁⲭⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲩⲙⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ. ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ ⲉⲩⲟ ⲛ̄ⲱⲃⲏⲣ ⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ.

10.6: ⲡⲉⲧⲃⲏⲕ ⲉⲣⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲭⲙ̄ ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲛⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲣⲛ̄ ⲟⲩϯⲣⲉ ⲉⲩⲥⲱⲛ̄ⲧ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ.[282] ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲭⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗⲛ̄ⲣⲛⲧⲏ̄ ⲉⲩⲧⲁⲣⲉ ⲉⲩⲧⲁⲕⲟ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲩⲱⲛⲛ̄ⲥ̄ ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲁⲩ.

10.7: ⲟⲩⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲱ ⲡⲉⲧⲱⲟⲟⲡ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲙ ⲥⲓ ⲥⲱ ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲡⲱⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲉ. ⲡⲉⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲱ ⲇⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ. ⲱⲱⲉ ⲉⲁⲁⲩ ⲣⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲛⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲣⲁⲣⲉⲣ.

---

[279] A couple of letters are missing at the end of a line.

[280] There is a small lacuna in the middle of this word, found at the end of a line. The conjectural completion is that suggested by Anthony Alcock (private communication, July 2013.)

[281] Only ⲁⲁⲩ can be read in T. The word is completed following Rossi.

[282] See on this the comment on the translation.

10.1: Woe to the man who forgets himself. You have been given the chance of divinization on the basis of your deeds (πρᾶξις)[283] yet your very carelessness (ἀμέλεια) has caused you to assume the likeness of a demon (δαίμων); for it is indeed (καὶ γάρ) their carelessness (ἀμέλεια) which has made them thus.

10.2: A careless (ἀμελής) man is destroyed in oblivion. For (γάρ) who will bring to life anyone who is careless regarding his own salvation?

10.3: Anyone who is concerned for his salvation spends the night within the doorway of the house of God and is not ignorant of what is to be read.

10.4: Anyone who is ignorant of the reading (ἀνάγνωσις) is a beast. Whoever applies his heart to the reading will not sin.

10.5: Anyone who loves the word of God loves God. Anyone who concerns himself with this is a friend of God.

10.6: Anyone who comes to the Body (σῶμα) of the Lord in a state of drunkenness angers God;[284] anyone who receives it (sc. the Body of the Lord) in his heart whilst drunk loses his own life.

10.7: There is a time for eating and drinking in accordance with (κατά) proper moderation; there is a time for the mystery (μυστήριον), and it is fitting to undertake this with great carefulness.

---

[283] There is a slight lacuna in the text at this point, but there is sufficient to form sense.

[284] Alternatively, in translating this, we might follow Revillout and Rossi who translate "Anyone who comes to the Body of the Lord as though to a drinking-bout …" In the light of the following clause, and in view of the awkwardness of the expression here we may suggest that this was the original sense, and that the introductory conjunction was ἵνα, which rendered as *hn'*, led to the present ambiguity. The translation is given here, however, as this is the more natural understanding of the text as extant. See, however, the further comments below.

10.8: ⲡⲉⲧϫⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲡⲉⲥⲛⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉ$\overline{\text{ⲭⲥ}}$ ⲫⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲧⲃⲃⲟ ⲁⲩϫⲓ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ[285] ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲩⲛ̄ⲟⲟⲙ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥ ⲣⲉⲩⲙⲟⲟⲩⲧ.

10.9: ⲥⲙⲟⲧⲛ̄ ⲇⲉ[286] ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥ ⲣⲉⲩⲙⲟⲟⲩⲧ ⲉⲣⲟⲩⲟ ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲫⲁⲓⲣⲉⲧⲓⲕⲟⲥ. ⲛ̄ⲫⲁⲓⲣⲉⲧⲓⲕⲟⲥ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛⲉⲩⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲉⲡⲉⲩⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲙ̄ⲙⲓⲛ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ.

10.10: ⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛ̄ⲫⲉⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲁⲛ ⲛⲉ ⲫⲙ̄ ⲡⲉ $\overline{\text{ⲡⲛⲁ}}$ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲉⲩϫⲓ ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲏⲧ ⲉⲁⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉ.

11: ⲟⲩⲱⲡⲏⲣⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲣⲏ ⲫⲛ̄ ⲡⲉⲧϫⲟⲥⲉ. ⲟⲩⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲡⲉ ⲛⲁⲫⲣⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲟⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ. [ ][287] ⲧⲁⲓ ⲧⲉ ⲑⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲟⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲏ ⲛⲁⲫⲣⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲟⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ. ⲉⲱϫⲉ ⲙ̄ⲛⲱⲥⲟⲙ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲡⲫⲟ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲏ ⲉⲩⲱⲟⲟⲡ ⲫⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲩⲧⲉⲗⲏⲥ ⲧⲁⲓ ⲧⲉ ⲑⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ⲱⲥⲟⲙ ⲛ̄ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲉⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲡⲙⲉⲧⲉⲑⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲡⲩⲫⲟ ⲛ̄ⲩⲱⲛϩ. ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲕⲱ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲡⲉϫⲁⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲩⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲫⲙ̄ ⲡⲣⲏ. ⲡⲉⲩⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲟⲩⲉⲓⲛ ⲫⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲉ. ⲉⲱϫⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ⲱϫⲟⲙ ⲛ̄ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲉⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲏ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲧⲣⲓⲱⲱϥ[288] ⲕⲁⲓⲡⲉⲣ ⲉⲩⲥⲱϫⲃ̄ ⲉⲙⲁⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲣⲣⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲟⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ. ⲡⲁⲣⲁ ⲉⲡⲧⲏⲣ [ ] ⲉⲟⲩⲁ ⲛ̄ⲁⲱϫⲟⲟⲥ. [ ] ⲧⲁ ⲟⲩⲕⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲩ[ ] ⲙⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲓⲣⲉ. ⲡⲁⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲁⲩⲧ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϥ ⲣⲙⲙⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙ ⲕⲁⲣⲡⲟⲥ [ ]ⲣⲱⲁⲩ. ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ⲧⲉⲕⲧⲓⲥⲓⲥ[289] ⲛⲁ[ ] ⲁⲩ ⲁⲛ ⲁϫⲛ̄ⲧⲟ̄ ⲁⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲕⲁⲑⲓⲥⲧⲁ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲉⲍⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ.

---

[285] ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ. Cf Revillout's reading: ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲙ. The letters are faded, but Rossi's reading is to be preferred, as the fourth letter is either ⲟ or ⲥ.

[286] Revillout supplies ⲧⲉ here.

[287] An entire line and a half line following have been erased and rewritten here in an illegible hand. See the translation for a possible reconstruction.

[288] ⲉⲧⲣⲓⲱⲱϥ: so Rossi, indicating the second ⲱ as unclear. Cf. Revillout who reads ⲉⲧⲣⲁ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ.

[289] Such is Rossi's reading. Cf. that of Revillout: ⲟⲩⲧⲉⲕⲧⲓⲥⲓⲥ

10.8: Anyone who receives the body (σῶμα) and blood of Christ in purity receives a great essence (οὐσία),[290] and a great power to raise the dead.

10.9: It is easier to raise the dead than to persuade (πείθειν) a heretic (αἱρετικός.) For (γάρ) heretics (αἱρετικός) have no belief in God, nor (οὔτε) in the saints, but (ἀλλά) in their own desires.

10.10: Any desire, however (δέ), which does not come from the Holy Spirit (πνᾱ) leads to hell.

11: The sun in the heights is a wonderful thing, but it is nothing compared to the glory of God. [Like a spark before a furnace][291] so is the sun before the glory of God. Just as no man is able to look directly at the sun, slight (εὐτελής) as is its size, so nobody is able to look upon the greatness (μέγεθος) of God, for (γάρ) nobody looks upon his face and lives. For (γάρ) he has established, it says, his place in the sun,[292] yet (δέ) his place is light in truth. If nobody is able to look upon the essence (οὐσία) of the sun, because of the dwelling place of God which is within it, even though (καίπερ) it is insignificant before the face of the glory of God…[293] For (γάρ) it gives its heat so that fruit (καρπός) may ripen,[294] nor (οὐδέ) would creation (κτίσις) survive[295] without it, for (γάρ) God has established (καθιστιέναι) it to have authority (ἐξουσία) over the day.

[290] οὐσία is Rossi's reading. The papyrus is faded and Revillout reads *ouōm* (food).

[291] A line and a half-line following have been erased and (largely) illegibly rewritten. The bracketed material is purely conjectural, based on a suggestion of Revillout, followed apparently by Rossi.

[292] Ps 18:6.

[293] Three largely illegible lines follow. Some words can be read but nothing which makes coherent sense.

[294] T is damaged here, and the verb is conjectural, based on sense.

[295] T is damaged here, and the verb, once again, is conjectural.

ϣϫε ⲡⲥⲱⲛⲧ̄ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲧⲁⲉⲓⲛⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲉⲓⲉ [ ] ⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥⲥⲟⲛⲧϥ̄ ⲟⲩⲟⲧⲃ̄ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲏⲣ. ϣϫε ⲉⲣⲉ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉⲑⲛⲟⲥ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲟ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲁⲡⲟⲧ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗⲣⲛ̄ ⲑⲁⲗⲁⲥⲥⲁ ⲛⲁⲣⲣⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲟⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲣⲟ[ ]ⲩ ⲇⲉ ϥ̄ϧⲟⲥⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ϥ̄ⲧⲁⲉⲓⲛⲩ ⲛⲁⲣⲣⲙ̄ ⲥⲱⲛⲧ̄ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲛ. ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲟⲩⲁⲙⲏⲧⲣⲏⲧⲟⲥ ⲡⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϥⲙⲟⲩⲣ ⲙ̄ⲡⲧⲏⲣϥ̄. ⲉ[ ] ⲣⲓϧⲛ̄ ⲛⲉϧⲉⲣⲟⲩⲃⲓⲛ ⲉϥϣϫϧⲛ̄ ⲙ̄ⲡⲧⲏⲣϥ̄ ϥ̄ⲟ ⲛ̄ⲣⲟⲧⲉ. ⲟⲩⲉⲡⲓⲑⲩⲙⲓⲁ ⲧⲏⲣϥ̄ ⲡⲉ. ⲛⲓⲙ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁϥϥⲉⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲣⲗⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲡⲉⲣ. ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲉⲣⲗⲟⲥ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲁⲧϣⲁϫⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ϣⲁⲣⲉ ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲥⲟⲡ̄ⲥ̄ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲉϣⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ. ⲉⲧϣⲁⲛⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲕⲟⲩⲓ ⲛ̄ϥⲧⲥⲁⲃⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲩⲕⲟⲩⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲉⲣⲟⲥ [ ][296] ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ϥⲭⲱⲙⲙⲟⲥ ⲧⲥⲧⲏⲩ ⲛⲧⲱⲧⲥ[297] ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲅⲁⲡⲏ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ϥⲛⲁⲉⲡⲓⲑⲩⲙⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲉϥϩⲛⲡ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲉϥⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲡⲉϥⲥⲛⲟϥ. ⲡⲁⲓ ⲣⲱ ⲉⲩⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲭⲉ ⲡⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲉϥⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ.[298] ⲉⲣϣⲁⲛⲟⲩⲁ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲟⲗⲙⲁ ⲉⲭⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲛ̄ϥⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲁⲛ ϥ̄ⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲉⲛⲟⲭⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲡⲉⲥⲛⲟϥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ. ⲡⲁⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲡϩⲁⲓⲁⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲣⲉ ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲭⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ϩⲛⲧϥ̄ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥⲙⲉⲣⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ.

12.1: ϣⲟⲣⲡ̄ ⲙⲉ[ ] ⲛ̄ⲧⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲁϣϥ̄ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥϣⲱ[ⲡⲉ] ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲛ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲧⲣⲉⲛⲁⲁϥ ϩⲱϥ ⲛ̄ⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁ. ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲟⲕ[ ] ⲛ̄ⲧⲛ̄ⲁⲁϥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧϩⲓⲧⲟⲩⲱ[ⲛ]. ⲡⲁⲓ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲉⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏⲧⲏⲥ.

12.2: ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉϥϫⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧϩⲓⲧⲟⲩⲱϥ ⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲛ̄ⲥ̄ ⲙⲛ̄ⲧϥ̄ ⲕⲟⲓⲛⲱⲛⲓⲁ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲡⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣ.

12.3: ⲟⲩⲁ ⲉϥⲱⲃϣ̄ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ ⲉⲡⲉⲧϩⲓⲧⲟⲩⲱϥ ⲉϥⲕⲏⲕⲁϩⲏⲩ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲟⲃϣⲱⲟⲩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ϩⲱⲱϥ ⲉϥⲕⲏⲕⲁϩⲏⲩ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲃⲏⲙⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉ$\overline{\text{ⲭⲥ}}$.

---

296 Four lines follow in which individual letters only are legible.

297 ⲛⲧⲱⲧⲥ is written in a secondary hand. These lines are much erased and corrected.

298 There is significant corruption in these lines; the reconstruction of Rossi is followed here.

If that which is created is so to be honoured, how much does the one who created it surpass it? Since all the nations (ἔθνος) are as a cup of water from the sea (θάλασσα) compared to the glory of God,[299] how much more is he to be exalted and honoured, compared to all he created on our account. For (γάρ) God is immeasurable (ἀμέτρητος) and he fills the universe. [Seated] upon the cherubim[300] he leaves the universe in fear. He is our whole desire (ἐπιθυμία). For (γάρ) who ever bears the sweetness of God? On account of the sweetness the saints pray to him, though they do not see him. He gives only partial (μέρος) instruction to those who are persuaded (πείθειν) only a little…[301] On this account it is said: "Who would resist love (ἀγάπη) and would anyone not desire the good things concealed in his body (σῶμα) and his blood?" So they call it the "sacred mystery (μυστήριον)."[302] Anyone who dares (τολμᾶν) to receive it without being purified is guilty (ἔνοχος) of the body (σῶμα) and the blood of the Lord. This is the sanctification (ἁγιασμός) which a man may receive in his heart and love.

12.1: Firstly,[303] whatever you would not want to befall you, do not do to anybody else. And be loving to your neighbour. This is the law (νόμος) and the prophets (προφήτης).

12.2: A man who does injustice to his neighbour has no communion (κοινωνία) with the saviour (σωτήρ.)

12.3: Anyone who neglects his neighbour in nakedness will be neglected in nakedness at the tribunal (βῆμα) of Christ.

---

[299] Cf. Isaiah 40:15.

[300] Cf. Isaiah 37:16.

[301] Approximately four lines here are illegible.

[302] There is significant corruption in this line. Rossi's reconstruction is followed.

[303] There is some corruption here, and at least one word is untranslated.

12.4: ⲡⲉⲧⲃⲏⲕ ⲉⲣⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲭⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲑⲩⲥⲓⲁⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲉⲩⲣⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲭⲱⲣⲙ̄ ⲙ̄ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲛⲟⲉⲓⲕ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲧⲁⲁⲩ ⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧⲩ̄ ⲛ̄ⲧⲥⲁⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲁⲧⲭⲉⲛⲁ. ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲣ[ⲛⲟⲥ]. [ ]

13.1: ⲙⲉⲧⲁⲛⲟⲓⲁ ⲇⲉ ⲣⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲉ ⲱⲁⲥⲭⲣⲟ ⲉⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ.

13.2: ⲡⲙⲁⲉⲓⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲉⲧⲁⲛⲟⲓⲁ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲣⲓⲙⲉ. ⲡⲣⲓⲙⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲱⲁⲛⲛⲉⲧ ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ.

14.1: ⲧⲥⲃⲱ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲕⲱⲛⲣⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲩⲣ̄ⲱⲃⲛⲣ ⲉⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉⲩⲣ̄ⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲩⲛⲁⲡⲣⲟⲕⲟⲡⲧⲉ ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲡⲉⲕⲟⲩⲱⲱ.

14.2: ⲙⲁⲣⲉⲩⲱⲓⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁ ⲧⲉⲥⲃⲱ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲟⲧⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ. ⲙⲁⲣⲉⲩⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲡⲉⲩⲥⲃⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲛ̄ⲣⲛⲧⲩ̄.

14.3: ⲧⲉⲡ ⲧⲉⲕⲧⲁⲡⲣⲟ ⲉⲡⲱⲁⲭⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲅⲙⲟⲟⲱⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲣⲉⲛⲥⲁⲃⲉ.

14.4: ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲧⲉⲡ ⲣⲱⲕ ⲉⲱⲣ̄ⲕ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲥⲁⲣⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲕⲁⲑⲓⲕⲱⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ.

14.5: ⲱⲓⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁ ⲡⲉⲥⲛⲟⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲁⲣⲉ ⲡⲉⲥⲛⲟⲩ ⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲣⲛ̄ ⲣⲱⲕ.

14.6: ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲥⲉⲱ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲡⲧⲏⲣⲩ̄ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲕ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲱ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲧⲣⲉ ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲥⲟⲱⲕ̄ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲕ ⲣⲱⲱⲕ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲥⲱⲱ.

14.7: ⲧⲉⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲣⲗⲗⲟ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲕⲁⲙⲁ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲣⲙⲟⲟⲥ.

14.8: ⲱⲓⲡⲉ ⲣⲏⲧⲩ̄ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲛ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛⲁ†ⲛⲟⲩⲟ̄ⲥ̄ ⲛⲁⲕ.

14.9: ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲟⲩⲉⲣ ⲣⲓⲥⲉ ⲉⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ. ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲣⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲱ ⲡⲥⲟⲛ ⲥⲛⲁⲩ.

14.10: ⲟⲩⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲕ ⲟⲉⲓⲕ ⲡⲟⲱⲩ̄ ⲉⲭⲱⲕ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲡⲉⲧⲣⲓⲧⲟⲩⲱⲕ.

12.4: Anyone who approaches the altar (θυσιαστήριον) defiled with adultery will be delivered to unquenchable fire. For (γάρ) the man who is a fornicator (πόρνος)… [304]

13.1: Repentance (μετάνοια δέ) conquers every sin in truth.

13.2: The sign of repentance (μετάνοια) is tears; tears (δέ) wipe away sins.

14.1: Instruct your son not to keep company with sinners and he will advance (προκόπτεσθει) in accordance with (κατά) your will.

14.2: He should seek after the instruction of the teachers in the church (ἐκκλησία), he should examine their teaching in his heart.

14.3: Let your mouth be familiar with the word of God and journey with the wise.

14.4: Do not familiarize your mouth with oaths, and do not curse anyone who is in the image (καθίκων) of God.

14.5: Seek out the blessing, and let the blessing be in your mouth.

14.6: Do not be abusive to anyone at all, and if you do not wish anyone to insult you, do not yourself insult.

14.7: Honour an elder and give him your seat to sit on.

14.8: Be humble to all and nobody will do you harm.

14.9: Do not make anyone weary, and do not ask (αἰτεῖν) from a rich man twice.

14.10: If you have bread, share it with your neighbour.

[304] As discussed in the introduction, I suspect a lacuna here of four pages (two sheets.) The material published in this place by Revillout, followed by Rossi, is found in appendix 2.

14.11: ⲟⲩⲡⲁⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲛⲉⲧⲁⲱⲛⲉ. ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲧⲃⲱⲕ ⲛⲧⲟⲩⲡⲁⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲛⲉⲧⲟⲧⲛ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ. ⲕⲁⲛ ⲛⲧⲕ ⲟⲩⲣⲙⲙⲁⲟ ϫⲉⲕ ⲧⲉⲕⲁⲅⲓⲁⲕⲟⲛⲓⲁ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲛⲉⲕⲟⲩⲉⲣⲏⲧⲉ.

14.12: ⲧⲛⲧⲱⲛⲧ ⲉⲁⲃⲣⲁϩⲁⲙ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲛⲁⲱⲉ ⲛⲉⲩϩⲩⲡⲁⲣⲭⲟⲛⲧⲁ. ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲡⲙⲁ ⲛⲧⲉⲩⲙⲛⲧⲙⲁⲓⲱⲙⲙⲟ ⲁⲩⲛⲡⲱϫⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲙ ⲙⲛ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ.

14.13: ϩⲁⲑⲏ ⲙⲉⲛ ⲛϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ϫⲡⲉ ⲟⲩⲙⲛⲧⲱⲁⲛϩⲧⲏⲩ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲧⲁⲣⲟⲩⲱⲛϩⲧⲏⲩ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲕ.

14.14: ⲡⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲛⲧⲡⲟⲗⲓⲥ ⲛⲟⲩⲩ ⲛⲉ ⲛⲕⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲡⲟⲗⲓⲥ. ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲱⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉϥⲑⲟⲛⲉ ⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ. ⲉⲁⲱⲡⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲩⲣⲙⲙⲁⲟ ⲡⲉ ⲟⲩⲁ ⲁⲱⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲣⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲩⲥⲣⲩⲉ ⲉⲛⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ.

14.15: ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙⲉ ⲛⲛⲉⲧⲛⲁ ⲛⲛϩⲛⲕⲉ ⲉⲩⲕⲏⲕⲁϩⲏⲩ ⲛⲑⲉ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲕⲱⲧ ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲱⲡⲱⲥ ⲙⲡⲉⲩⲣⲁⲛ. ⲟⲩⲣⲙⲙⲁⲟ ⲉⲩⲛⲁ ⲛⲛϩⲛⲕⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲟⲩⲣⲙⲙⲁⲟ ⲡⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ.

14.16: ⲱⲁⲣⲉ ⲡϩⲛⲕⲉ ⲣⲁⲱⲉ ⲉⲩⲱⲁⲛⲱⲁϫⲉ ⲛⲙⲙⲁⲩ ϩⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲡⲣⲙⲙⲁⲟ. ⲉⲩϩⲉⲗⲡⲓⲍⲉ ⲉⲙⲧⲟⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙⲙⲟⲩ. ⲱⲱⲉ ⲛϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲉⲡⲣⲙⲙⲁⲟ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲣⲁⲱⲉ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲧⲣⲉⲩⲧⲱⲙⲛ̄ⲧ ⲉⲡϩⲛⲕⲉ. ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲩⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩ ϫⲉ ⲁⲩⲣⲱⲃⲏⲣ ⲉⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ.

14.17: ⲡⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲛⲥⲁⲃⲉ ⲧⲱⲩ ⲧⲉ ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲣⲙⲙⲁⲟ ⲙⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ. ⲡϩⲛⲕⲉ ϩⲱⲱⲩ ⲛⲥⲁⲃⲉ ⲧⲱⲩ ⲧⲉ ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲣⲙⲙⲁⲟ ⲙⲡⲕⲉⲁⲓⲱⲛ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲛⲙⲡⲛⲩⲉ ⲧⲉ.

14.11: Visit the sick, and go also to visit those who are imprisoned. Even if (κἄν) you are rich perform your sacred duty (ἀγιακονία) on your feet.

14.12: Be like Abraham; he was likewise wealthy in worldly goods (ὑπάρχοντα), and on account of his hospitality was found worthy to dine with God.[305]

14.13: Above all else be merciful always so that somebody may pity you.

14.14: The head (ἄρχων) of the town (πόλις), his are all things in the town (πόλις). On this account it is not fitting that he should begrudge (φθονεῖν) anyone. It is all the more fitting that anyone who is rich should act faithfully (πιστός), and spend time in the church (ἐκκλησία).

14.15: God loves anyone who pities the poor one who is naked as though he built a sanctuary (τόπος) in his name; a rich man who pities the poor is enriched by God.

14.16: The poor man rejoices when a rich man addresses him; he hopes (ἐλπίζειν) for some consolation from him. It is fitting for a rich man to rejoice the more when he meets the poor man and he should be glad that he has had companionship with a man of God.

14.17: The wise ruler (ἄρχων), his is the wealth of the world (κόσμος); the poor man, however, his is the wealth of the other age (αἰών) which is the kingdom of the heavens.

[305] Genesis 18:1–8.

15.1: ⲟⲩⲣⲟⲧⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲣⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲩⲉⲟⲟⲩ. ⲡⲉⲟⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙⲟⲩⲣ ⲙⲡⲧⲏⲣⲩ̄. ⲛⲓⲙ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲱⲣⲱⲡ ⲉⲛⲉⲩⲃⲁⲗ. ⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲁⲑⲏⲧ ⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁ ⲉⲓⲙⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲩ. ⲛ̄ⲩⲱⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲫ̄ ⲛ̄ⲟⲛ̄ⲩ̄ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲧⲣⲁⲡⲉⲧⲏⲥ.

15.2: ⲁⲣⲓⲣⲟⲧⲉ ⲣⲏⲧⲫ̄ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲱ ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲙⲧⲱⲙⲱⲉ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲣⲙ̄ ⲧⲉⲕⲡⲣⲟⲣⲁⲓⲣⲉⲥⲓⲥ. ⲟⲩⲱⲛ̄ⲩ̄ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲕⲛⲟⲩⲥ.

15.3: ⲱⲱ ⲉⲣⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲩ ⲣⲙ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲛⲁ ⲛ̄ⲛⲣⲏⲕⲉ.

15.4: ϯ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲕⲟⲉⲓⲕ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲣⲁⲕⲁⲉⲓⲧ.

15.5: ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲧⲱⲱⲣⲡ̄ ⲉⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ.

15.6: ⲁⲩⲱ ⲥⲉⲡⲥ ⲧⲥⲓⲝ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲏⲕⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲛⲡⲉ. ⲁⲩⲱ ϯⲛⲁⲩ ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲧⲉⲕⲥⲟⲙ.

15.7: ⲟⲩⲡⲣⲟⲥⲫⲟⲣⲁ ⲙⲁⲣⲉⲥⲱⲟⲩⲡⲉ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲣⲙ̄ ⲡⲛⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ. ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲁⲡⲁⲣⲭⲏ ⲛ̄ⲛⲅⲉⲛⲛⲙⲁ ⲁⲣⲓⲱⲟⲣⲫ̄ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲙⲧ̄ ⲧⲁⲁⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲛⲛⲃ.

15.8: ϯ ⲣⲁ ⲧⲉⲕϩⲩⲭⲏ ⲛ̄ⲣⲟⲥⲟⲛ ⲕⲟⲛ̄ⲫ̄. ⲉⲣⲱⲁⲛ ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲙⲟⲩ ⲙⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲉⲭⲱⲁϫⲉ ⲛⲁⲙⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ.

15.9: ⲛⲉⲧⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁ ⲡⲣⲱⲃ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲩⲥⲓⲝ ⲟⲩⲛⲥⲟⲙ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ ⲉϯⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲛⲁ [ ][306] ⲁⲣⲓⲕⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲩ [ ][307] ⲉⲱϫⲉ ⲟⲩⲛⲁ ⲁⲣⲓⲕⲉ ⲉⲡⲣⲏⲕⲉ ϫⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲫ̄ⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲏⲧ.

[306] Approximately half a line is illegible, a few letters only being discernible.

[307] ⲉⲩⲱⲁⲛ may be read, followed by approximately one third of an illegible line.

15.1: A fearful thing is God with his glory. The glory of God fills the universe. Who is there who can escape his eye? The foolish thinks that there is nobody who sees him. He does not know that he is living like a runaway (δραπέτης).[308]

15.2: Man, fear God. Serve him with your will (προαίρεσις). Reveal your mind (νοῦς) to him.

15.3: Call upon him in pity for the poor.

15.4: Give your bread to anyone who is hungry.[309]

15.5: And hurry to the church (ἐκκλησία).

15.6: And stretch out your hand to the poor daily. And give to him in accordance (κατά) your ability.

15.7: Make an offering (προσφορά) in the house of God, and hurry to bring the firstfruits (ἀπαρχή) of your produce (γέννημα) to the priest.

15.8: Give for your life (ψυχή) while (ὅσον) you live, for (γάρ) when a man dies his word does not remain.

15.9: If those who do not have anything except the thing which is of their hands have charity…[310] blame him …[311] If the poor man is blamed because he is not compassionate, what indeed will it be like for a rich man who piles gold upon gold until it rusts, and fills coffers with clothes until they are moth-eaten?

---

[308] Cf. the renditions of Revillout "Il ne sait pas qu'il est dans la vie come un convive" and Rossi, "Egli ignora che trovasi nella vita come ad un convito." Both read the Greek word here, transcribed into Coptic as *trapetes*, as τράπεζα. The correction is made by Robert Atkinson, "On Professor Rossi's Publication of South-Coptic Texts" *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy (1889–1901)* 3 (1893–1896), 24–99, at 47.

[309] Isa. 58:7.

[310] A half line is missing here.

[311] A further half line is missing. The sense, in the light of what follows, appears to be that a poor person who does not give, because he is unable, should not attract blame. Rossi rather garbles this sentence through misreading.

15.10: ⲉⲓⲉ ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲟ ⲉⲩⲕⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲃ ⲉⲭⲛ̄ ⲛⲟⲩⲃ ϣⲁⲛⲧⲟⲩⲣ̄ϣⲛⲃⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲩ̄ ⲛⲟⲩⲩ̈ ⲛ̄ⲩⲉⲛⲧⲏⲏⲃⲉ ⲛ̄ⲩⲟⲓⲧⲉ ϣⲁⲛⲧⲟⲩⲣ̄ⲩⲟⲟⲗⲉ. ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲱ ⲛⲁⲙⲉⲣⲁⲧⲉ ⲩⲱⲥ ⲉⲁⲛⲉⲓⲙⲉ ⲭⲉ ⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲙ̄ⲡⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲩⲙ̄ ⲡⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲣ̄ⲛⲙⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲛⲁ.[312] ⲡⲛⲁ ⲡⲉⲭⲁⲩ ϣⲁⲩϣⲁⲟⲩϣⲁⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ ⲉⲭⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲕⲣⲓⲥⲓⲥ. ⲛⲁⲉⲓⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲡⲉⲭⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲏⲧ ⲭⲉ ⲙ̄ⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲛⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲩ. ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲱ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ ⲭⲉ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ϣⲁⲛⲩⲧⲏⲩ ⲭⲉ ⲟⲩϣⲁⲛⲩⲧⲏⲩ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲉⲓⲱⲧ. ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲕⲣⲓⲛⲉ ⲭⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲩⲕⲣⲓⲛⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲱⲧⲛ̄. ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲧⲥⲁⲉⲓⲟ ⲭⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲩⲧⲥⲁⲉⲓⲉ ⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̄. ⲕⲱ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲧⲁⲣⲟⲩⲕⲱ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ̄ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ. † ⲧⲁⲣⲟⲩ† ⲛⲏⲧⲛ̄. ⲟⲩϣⲓ ⲉⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲩ ⲉⲩⲧⲉⲥⲧⲱⲥ ⲉⲩⲛⲉϩⲛⲟⲩϩ ⲉⲩⲡⲉⲛⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲧⲁⲁⲩ ⲉⲕⲟⲩⲛ ⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̄. ⲅⲙ̄ ⲡϣⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁϣⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ ⲉⲩⲛⲁϣⲓ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ̄ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ.

15.11: ⲡⲁⲓ ⲡⲉⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲙ̄ⲙⲛ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ϣⲁ ⲉⲡⲉϩ ⲛ̄ⲉⲡⲉϩ ⲅⲁⲙⲏⲛ.

[312] ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲱ ⲛⲁⲙⲉⲣⲁⲧⲉ ⲅⲱⲥ ⲉⲁⲛⲉⲓⲙⲉ ⲭⲉ ⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲙ̄ⲡⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲅⲙ̄ ⲡⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲣ̄ⲛⲙⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲛⲁ. So T. Cf. however Revillout's reading, which begins ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲱⲛⲁ ⲙⲉⲣⲁⲧⲉ, and omits ⲛⲁⲣ̄ⲛⲙⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲛⲁ at the end. For the sense he derives from this, see the notes to the translation.

15.10: On this account, my beloved, as (ὡς) we know what the will of God is with regard to mercy, let us love mercy.[313] It is said that[314] compassion is more highly exalted than judgement (κρίσις).[315] For, he says,[316] "Blessed are the compassionate, compassion will be shown to them."[317] The Lord Jesus said: "Be merciful, because your Father is merciful. Do not judge (κρίνειν) so that you be not judged (κρίνειν). Do not condemn, that you be not condemned. Forgive, and you will be forgiven. Give, and it will be given to you. A measure, goodly, plentiful, pressed down, overflowing, will be poured into your lap. For (γάρ) with the measure with which you measure, will it be measured for yourselves."[318]

15.11: So to him be glory, and to God, to the ages of the ages. Amen.

[313] "On this account… love mercy." Cf., however, Revillout's rendering, based on a rather odd reading of T (on which see the notes to the text): "Ne savons-nous pas à ce sujet que la volonté de Dieu est la miséricorde?"

[314] Or "He says" (followed by direct speech).

[315] Cf. Hosea 6:6; Matt. 9:13 and par.

[316] Or "It is said that…" (followed by indirect speech).

[317] Matt. 5:7.

[318] Luke 6:36–38. NB also 7.10 above.

NOTES

Chapter 1. To the commencement of such a collection of directives with a doctrinal introduction setting out the Trinitarian faith, cf. the *Canones Hippolyti*, *Fides patrum* and the *Canones Basilii*. This is relatively brief, and would seem to have been constructed as a head to this collection, given that it moves rapidly from setting out the anti-Arian position (as discussed in the introduction) towards an anthropology in the light of which it is possible to read the moral directives which follow. This is also the rationale for the statement that nothing is created which is capable of salvation of itself; here the implied opponent here is possibly Gnostic; Clement makes a similar point against Basilides at the beginning of *Strom.* 5.1. The implication in the present context is that humanity is in need of salvation, and that this salvation has to be obtained, and that the basis for such salvation is the right use of the human *autexousion*. We may note the use of the fundamentally stoic language of *prohairesis* and *autexousion*, though we may well suspect that it is mediated through Christian authors. Thus our author's assertions may readily be compared to that of Justin: For God, wishing that both angels and humans, who are free in inclination (ἐλευθέρᾳ προαιρέσει) and have freewill (αὐτεξουσίους), made them so that they might be able to do whatever in accordance with their abilities…" (*Dial.* 88.5, with similar statements at *Dial.* 102.4 and 141.1). Similarly Clement *Strom.* 4.153.1–2; 6.134. 1–2; 135.1–2; 4.136.2 upholds human *autexousia*, and we may note Origen's brief but significant discussion at the beginning of *Princ.* 3 (which Frede suggests is also motivated by opposition to Gnostic ideas regarding the inevitability of certain persons' salvation and others' damna-

tion.)[1] We may also compare, particularly to 1.7–8, the statement of Evagrius *Sententiae* 54: "There is no angel incapable of evil and there is no demon evil by nature, for God made both according to his will."[2]

Chapter 2. We may note in particular statements within the catechetical tradition as received in church orders for the direction to begin the day in church, in particular *Traditio apostolica* 35/41, received and rewritten in *Canones Hippolyti* 26. *Didascalia apostolorum* 2.59–60 is also comparable, though this emphasizes attendance on the Lord's day, rather than daily instruction. In *Traditio apostolica* this may be taken as the mark of a scholasticized Christian community; as suggested in the introduction, the community from which these *Gnomai* derive is also oriented towards scholastic activity.

On the matter of weeping for one's sins cf. Evagrius *Sententiae* 39: "Sadness is burdensome and *acedia* is irresistible, but tears shed before God are stronger than both." Note also 13.2 below, a homiletic section ending with the gnomic utterance: "The sign of repentance (μετάνοια) is tears; tears (δέ) wipe away sins."

Chapter 3. On talking in church cf., similarly, John Chrysostom *Hom. in 1 Tim.* 9, who comments on women talking more in church than at the market or the bath, and suggests that the conversation is competing with his preaching to be heard. There is less obvious comparative material in the church order tradition, though the appointment of officers to keep order in church (e.g., at *Didascalia apostolorum* 2.57.10, the deacon), implies that such activity was required.

Chapter 4. In passing from the issue of men eyeing up women in church to the dress and adornment of women the gnomologist again echoes the Church order tradition; thus *Didascalia apostolorum* 1.8.26 similarly directs women to cover their faces in the street, and *Constitutiones apostolorum* 6.29 states that the women of old called

---

[1] Michael Frede, *A free will: origins of the notion in ancient thought* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011), 113–119.

[2] The *Sententiae* of Evagrius here and *passim* are cited from Robert E. Sinkewicz, *Evagrius of Pontus: the Greek ascetic corpus.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

their husbands "my lord." We may also compare for much of the material *Canons Basilii* 26; it is particularly noteworthy that the saying that a woman who hates sin may be known by the purity of her face is likewise found there. It is also found in C, possibly by independent transmission. However, beyond the church order tradition we may also note the lively discussion of behaviour in church, making similar points about feminine adornment, in Chrysostom *Hom. in 1 Tim.* 8, a discussion which is also found in his *De virginitate* 61–63 and in *Fem. reg.*1, 7.

Chapter 5. Directives to men, who are to have short hair (so we are probably to understand 5.3. below) and beards, are common enough. Cf., e.g., *Canones Basilii* 27, *Didascalia apostolorum* 1.3.8–11, Clement *Paed.* 3.3. This is clearly a common theme in catechetical discourse, taken up by the church order tradition.

Having already noted the Chrysostomic *Hom. in 1 Tim.* 9 we may also note that this, similarly, deals, with the education of children (note also *Gnomai* 17.1 below.)

Also notable is the emphasis on the father of a prospective virgin, who presumably is to remain within the family home (the *Canones Athanasii* 98 suggest that the presence of a virgin within the household is a blessing for all within it). This is also reminiscent of the comment in *Vita Syncleticae* 6 that Syncletica was still in her father's house when she began her life of askesis.[3] Cf., however, a fragment of Peter of Alexandria referring to a virgin who had been dedicated to the church by her parents.[4]

Chapter 6.1. Cf. to all this Athanasius *Ep. 1 ad virg.* 12–17, likewise setting out Mary as a model for virgins within the church. Lammeyer suggests comparison with the *Historia de nativitate Mariae*,[5] but this work almost certainly predates the *Gnomai*, and is de-

[3] PG28 1489B

[4] Published by Carl Schmidt, *Fragmente einer Schrift des Märtyrerbischofs Petrus von Alexandria* (TU 5.4b; Leipzig: Akademie, 1901)), here at p. 13

[5] Joseph Lammeyer, *Die sogenannte Gnomen des Concils von Nicaea: ein homiletischer Traktat des 4 Jahrhunderts* (Beirut: np, 1912), 77.

rived from the *Protoevangelium Jacobi*.[6] There are, moreover, differences between the two; thus *Historia de nativitate Mariae* 9 states that "the virgin, who was already well acquainted with angelic faces, and was not unused to the light from heaven, was neither terrified by the vision of the angel, nor astonished at the greatness of the light, but only perplexed by his words" whereas here she is startled at his voice (so also Athanasius *Ep. 1 ad virg.* 17). The *Protoevangelium* is comparable in its attitude here, but distinctly different in detail for whereas here Mary is depicted as living with her parents (the situation, as noted above, which would more probably be familiar to the gnomologist), in the *Protoevangelium* she resides at the Temple until her espousal to Joseph. There is a possible link, however in P, in which, in the discussion of feeding, as the footnote observes, there is a distinct reading attributing feeding activity to Gabriel. The statement of the *Protoevangelium Jacobi* 8 that Mary, in the Temple, was fed by an angel, or possibly the tradition lying behind this, may in some way have contributed to the corruption.[7]

Next we should note the belief in Mary's amenorrhea. For ancient physiologists menstrual blood was a by-product of excess eating; we may thus relate this belief in to the conviction that she ate only what was enough. Thus note Soranus' discussion of menstruation at *Gyn.* 1.4.19–23, in which he suggests that particularly active women (such as those preparing for singing contests) do not menstruate because there is no excess nutrition which needs to be diverted into menses.

Finally, as a matter of interest, we may observe the statement that Mary faced to the east to pray. This is common in Egyptian sources (see e.g. Origen, *De Oratione* 32, *Hom. in Lev.* 9.10.) The manner in which B stresses the way in which Mary deliberately fac-

---

[6] So Gijsel in J. Gijsel and R. Beyers *Libri de nativitate Mariae* (2 vols. CCSA 9–10; Turnhout: Brepols, 1997), 59–67.

[7] It is also found in a fragmentary life of the Virgin preserved in Coptic, found in Forbes Robinson (ed.), *Coptic apocryphal Gospels* (Texts and studies 4.2; Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1896), here at pp. 14–15. This text is also notable because, like the *Gnomai*, it emphasizes that she did not adorn herself, but states that she was surrounded by angels (here at pp. 16–17.)

es away from the west is reminiscent of the baptismal *apotaxis* and *syntaxis*, in which the candidate renounced the devil in a westward direction and then faced east to commit to God. This rite, Syrian in origin, had entered Egyptian baptismal liturgies by the time of Cyril of Alexandria (*Comm. in Joh.* PG74, 40D).

6.2–17. These directions to virgins may readily be paralleled from other, chiefly Egyptian, ascetic literature. So, on the matter of fasting the *Canones Athanasii* 92 direct that consecrated virgins should fast until evening,[8] the statement there that "whoever would maintain virginity should not fill *his* belly with bread, nor lie" being directly paralleled by *Gnome* 6.4. The statement of *Canones Athanasii* 92 are reinforced in canon 98. Likewise *Canones Basilii* 36 directs that widows and virgins should fast the entire day. [9] On the image of the virgin as the bride of Christ,[10] cf. the authentic Athanasian writings on virginity, and note the comments of Brakke, suggesting that this conveyed the notions of submission.[11] Such a submission is explicitly required of virgins here in 6.14 (if the reading of T is correct, on which matter see the footnotes), as implicitly of married women (to their husbands) at 5.4. On the matter of the inadvisability of virgins to be near married women cf. Evagrius *Sententiae* 24: "Have no dealings with secular women, lest they turn aside your heart and render just counsels ineffective." *Canones Athanasii* 92 similarly directs that married women should not speak of worldly things in the presence of virgins.[12] On the matter of undyed clothing for virgins cf. especially *Discourse on salvation* 11. Cf. also Evagrius *Sententiae* 23: "She who adorns her clothing will also be wanting in chastity." We may also note, again, Chrysostom *Hom. in 1 Tim.* 8, where professed virgins are also upbraided for their dress, in particular a dark garment being mentioned. Finally, on the suggestion

[8] Ed. Wilhelm Riedel, Walter E. Crum, *The Canons of Athanasius* (repr.; Amsterdam: Philo, 1973), p. 59.

[9] In Wilhelm Riedel, *Die Kirchenrechtsquellen des Patriarchats Alexandrien* (repr.; Aalen, Scientia, 1968), 255.

[10] Found in *Gnome* 6.5.

[11] David Brakke, *Athanasius and asceticism* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 70–2, 75–7.

[12] Riedel and Crum, *Canons of Athanasius*, 59.

that a *monachē* should not walk around during the day cf. Evagrius *Sententiae* 26: "The desire to walk about and the longing for houses of strangers upsets the state of the soul and destroys its zeal." Note also that Athanasius *Ep. 1 ad virg.* 13, in proposing Our Lady as a model for Christian virgins, suggests that she rarely left her house. What is distinct, as noted in the introduction, is the extensive expectation of reading. Cf. this to the suggestion of Evagrius, for whom only the first hour of the day is set aside.

Chapter 7. As the gnomologist moves on to the duties and concerns of men, we may note the statement that an adulterer is an infanticide by observing *Canones Hippolyti* 16: "A Christian who has a concubine, especially if she has had a child by him, if he marries another, it is a homicide, unless he catches her in fornication."[13] This is an alteration of a direction originally in *Traditio apostolica*, though it may well incorporate some other tradition, also found here, namely the characterization of somebody who deserts a child as a murderer (whereas the rationale behind considering an adulterer an infanticide is not made clear here.) The distinction between unmarried and married men in looking on other women may be seen in the light of *Canones Basilii* 12 which legislates distinct penalties for unmarried male fornicators, and for married men.

Finally we may observe again the Chrysostomic *Hom. in 1 Tim.* 9, which likewise speaks of the blessing which accrues to parents through the proper upbringing of their children. In the light of the weight of parallels we may well suspect that these homilies likewise reflect a catechetical tradition.[14]

Chapter 8. Beyond comparing 8.13 and 14 to *Canones Hippolyti* 21 excluding latecomers (apart from those who are sick) and noting once again the emphasis on hearing the scriptures in the gnomologist's understanding of the purpose of the Christian assembly, we may observe the manner in which the contrasting attitudes to the

---

[13] Tr. Carol Bebawi in Paul F. Bradshaw (ed.) *The Canons of Hippolytus* (Bramcote: Grove, 1987), 19.

[14] On these homilies generally note Korinna Zamfir, "Men and women in the house(hold) of God: Chrysostom's homilies on 1 Tim. 2, 8–15" *Sacra scripta* 6 (2008), 144–164.

reception of Communion, both in terms of those who received whilst in an unfit state and in terms of those who would not receive on account of a sense of unworthiness, is coherent with other evidence of such attitudes in fourth century monastic circles collected by Bradshaw.[15]

Chapter 9. Notable in this section is the presence of two *gnomai* which are found in the two ways tradition, namely the derivation of murder from hatred (Cf. Didache 3.2 and parallels) and the statement that "if we have communion with one another in life, how much more so in death" (cf. Didache 4.8 and parallels.) Beyond this there is a citation of Proverbs 10.12 in *Gnomē* 9.3. All of this implies a derivation from a traditional collection; in this light we may suggest that the stoic language of παρὰ φύσιν in 9.2 may equally derive from a traditional source.

Chapter 10. A series of *gnomai*, largely going over ground covered before, such as behaviour in church, the worthy reception of Communion, and the importance of listening to readings in church, linked by catchwords and thematic links. The difficulty over translating 10.6, however, should be observed; as suggested in the footnotes to the translation, it is possible that the rendering offered by Revillout and Rossi should be given. Socrates reports that Christians in the Thebaid celebrate the mysteries on the evening of Saturday,[16] and we may also note that in some monastic circles Communion was received at this time on Saturday.[17] This is, we may suggest, the residue of the sympotic gathering which once took place at this time; possibly, in circles known to the gnomologist, it was more than a residue!

Chapter 11. Appears to be a homiletic fragment which has become incorporated into the text. Possibly the rationale, on the assumption that the homiletic fragment already existed independently, is

---

[15] Paul F. Bradshaw, "Receiving Communion" in his *Reconstructing early Christian worship* (London: SPCK, 2009), 20–37, here at p. 30.

[16] *Historia ecclesiastica* 5.22.

[17] See Bradshaw, "Receiving Communion", 25.

the concern of the gnomologist with the proper reception of Communion, a subject to which the homilist turns.

Chapter 12. After the incorporation of a homiletic section, the gnomic collection begins again. In particular the inclusion of the "golden rule" may be observed here. Beyond scriptural parallels, note the appearance of this "golden rule" in Didache 1.2 and parallels within the two ways tradition (though, interestingly, in somewhat attenuated form in *Fides patrum*/*Syntagma doctrinae*.) The inclusion of this traditional material encourages us to think that the other *gnomai* collected here are also traditional, even though there is no obvious extant parallel.

Chapter 13. On the gift of tears observe the comments on ch. 2 above.

Chapter 14. Note a number of parallels with the Two Ways Tradition within this section. Thus to 14.2 cf. Didache 4.1–2 and par., to 14.4 cf. Didache 2.3 and par., to 14.8 cf. Didache 3.8–9 and par. It is not suggested that the Two Ways Tradition, even less the Didache itself, is a direct source, but that these *gnomai* reflect conventional catechesis which is ultimately derived from the Two Ways Tradition, and thus that those *gnomai* which do not have immediate parallels likewise demonstrate the content of catechesis.

Chapter 15. Although in gnomic form, the manner in which the Gospels are mined for *gnomai* in the concluding section indicates that these *gnomai* are less conventional, but are designed by the gnomologist to summarize the main import of the document.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: OSTRAKON C. 8123[1]

ⲛⲉⲩⲣⲱⲃ [ ] ⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲣⲛ̄ [ ]

ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲩⲭⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗⲣⲙ̄ ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲙⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲥⲛⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲭ̄ⲥ̄ ⲛ̄ⲥϣⲱⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲭⲓⲥⲟⲗ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲉⲧⲏⲡ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲣⲟⲩ ⲣⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧⲙⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲩ ⲙⲉⲩⲭⲓⲥⲟⲗ.

ⲡⲥⲁ ⲉⲧϣⲟⲩⲉⲓⲧ ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲥⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲏⲣ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲩ.

ⲩⲥⲣⲟⲩⲟⲣⲧ ⲛⲥⲓ ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲙⲉⲧⲉⲭⲉ ⲉⲡⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲣⲉⲧⲏ ⲣⲓⲟⲩⲥⲟⲡ [ ] ⲡⲉ ⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣ ⲟⲩⲱ ⲉⲩⲭⲱ (vo.) ⲙⲛ̄ϣⲟⲙ ⲛ̄ⲗⲁⲁⲩⲉ ⲉ̄ⲣ̄ⲣⲙⲣⲁⲗ ⲛ̄ⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲥⲛⲁⲩ.

ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁ̄ⲣⲟⲩⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲟⲩⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ ⲧⲁⲣⲟⲩ ⲩⲙϣⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲙⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩⲧⲁⲣⲟⲩ.

ⲉϣⲁⲩⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛ ⲟⲩⲥⲣⲓⲙⲉ ⲉⲥⲙⲟⲥⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲣⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲕⲁⲑⲁⲣⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲥⲣⲟ.

ϣⲟⲣⲡ[ⲕ] ⲉⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ ⲛ̄ϣⲟⲣⲡ ⲙⲛ̄ⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲉⲧⲧⲉⲭⲛⲏ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲕⲣⲱⲃ ⲛⲥⲓⲭ ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ ⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲥⲙⲟⲩ ⲉⲛⲉⲣⲃⲏⲩ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲕ[ⲥⲓⲭ.]

[1] Ed. W.E. Crum, *Coptic ostraca from the collections of the Egypt Exploration Fund, the Cairo Museum and others* (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1902), #16 (p. 5 of part II). Various corrections proposed by Crum are incorporated here.

APPENDIX 1: OSTRAKON C. 8123[2]

… his task (?) will be in …

It is not fitting that a man who participates in the Body (σῶμα) and Blood of Christ should be a deceiver, and whoever is acquainted entirely in truth and loves him will not deceive.[3]

A vain beauty is accompanied by hatred.[4]

Cursed is the man who shares in (μετέχειν) sin and virtue (ἀρετή) together; the saviour (σωτήρ) said it is impossible for anyone to serve two masters.

Whoever sins, and is of necessity (ἀνάγκη) overtaken by death is deserving of the death which overtakes him.

A woman who hates sin may be known by the purity (καθάρος) of her face.[5]

Hurry to the church (ἐκκλησία) first of all, rather than to the work (τέχνη) which you must do with your hands, so that God may bless your works…[6]

---

[2] Ed. W.E. Crum, *Coptic ostraca from the collections of the Egypt Exploration Fund, the Cairo Museum and others* (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1902), #16 (p. 5). See also p.7 of the first part. It is to be observed that this ostrakon preserves a number of minor divergences from the other texts, as well as containing two sentences which are not found in the other witnesses. Moreover, the order in which they are found here is distinct. As such, as suggested in the introduction, it may be an entirely independent production.

[3] Cf. 8.3.

[4] Cf. 4.7.

[5] Cf. 4.13; cf. also the *Canons of Basil* 26.

[6] Cf. 2.3.

APPENDIX 2: HOMILETIC MATERIAL FROM GIOV.AJ INCLUDED BY REVILLOUT AND ROSSI IN THE *GNOMAI*

[ ] ⲛⲉⲧ ⲣⲙ̄ⲡⲕⲁⲕⲉ [ ] ⲩⲟⲉⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲛⲏⲥⲧⲉⲓⲁ [ ][7] [ⲣⲁⲣⲉⲣ] ⲛⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲃⲁⲗ ⲉⲧⲥⲓⲛⲥⲱⲙⲧ̄ ⲉⲧⲙⲟⲩⲉⲓⲧ. ⲣⲁⲣⲉⲣ ⲉⲛⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲗⲁⲥ ⲉⲧⲕⲁⲧⲁⲗⲁⲗⲓⲁ. ⲣⲁⲣⲉⲣ ⲉⲛⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲙⲁⲁϫⲉ ⲉⲛⲓⲥⲓⲛⲥⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲉⲧⲙⲟⲩⲉⲓⲧ. ⲣⲁⲣⲉⲣ ⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲁⲡⲣⲟ ⲉⲛⲓⲥⲓⲛⲱⲣⲕ ⲉⲧⲙⲉⲣ ⲛ̄ⲙⲁⲗⲟⲩ ⲣⲓ ⲣⲟⲧⲉ. ⲙⲁⲣⲉ ⲡⲟⲩⲁ ⲡⲟⲩⲁ ⲙ̄ⲙⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲕⲁⲡⲛⲁ ⲣⲙ̄ ⲉⲩⲣⲏⲧ ⲉⲣⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲡⲉⲧⲣⲓⲧⲟⲩⲱⲩ. ⲙⲁⲣⲉ ⲡⲟⲩⲁ ⲡⲟⲩⲁ ⲥⲡⲟⲩⲇⲁⲍⲉ ⲉⲣⲁⲣⲉⲣ ⲉⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲛⲓⲉⲛⲧⲟⲗⲏ. ⲧⲁⲣⲉⲩⲥⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲃⲏⲕ ⲉⲣⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲡⲏⲓ ⲙ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲱⲗⲏⲗ. ⲉⲛⲱⲁⲛⲃⲱⲕ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲣⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲡⲏⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲛⲟⲧⲛ̄ ⲣⲙ̄ ⲡⲁⲩⲁⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲇⲓⲁⲃⲟⲗⲟⲥ ⲉⲛⲛⲁⲱⲥⲙⲥⲟⲙ ⲛ̄ⲁⲱ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉ ⲛ̄ⲱⲱⲡ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲛⲧⲟⲗⲏ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ. ⲛ̄ⲁⲱ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉ ⲕⲛⲁⲱⲗⲏⲗ ⲣⲙ̄ ⲡⲏⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲏ ⲛ̄ⲅⲛⲏⲥⲧⲉⲩⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲕⲣⲏⲧ ⲥⲟⲩⲧⲱⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛⲉⲕⲃⲓϫ ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲁⲛ. ⲡⲁⲩⲁⲛ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲟⲧⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲅⲛⲁⲱⲥⲙ̄ⲥⲟⲙ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲧⲁⲗⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲧⲟⲗⲏ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲇⲏⲙⲟⲥⲓⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ. ⲕⲭⲱ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲧ̄ⲡⲛⲏⲥⲧⲉⲓⲁ. ⲉⲕⲣⲣⲱⲃ ⲉⲡϫⲓⲛϫⲛ. ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲙⲉⲣ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲣⲛⲓⲁ. ⲡⲣⲏⲧ ⲙⲉⲣ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲱⲩ. ⲧⲉ ⲯⲩⲭⲏ [ ][8] ⲡⲗⲁⲥ ⲙⲉⲣ ⲛ̄ⲕⲁⲧⲁⲗⲁⲗⲓⲁ. ⲛ̄ⲥⲓϫ ⲙⲉⲣ ⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲩ. ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲉⲣⲛⲧⲉ ⲡⲱⲧ ⲉⲧⲕⲁⲕⲓⲁ. ⲧⲧⲁⲡⲣⲟ ϫⲓⲫⲟⲥ̄ⲥ̄ ⲣⲙ̄ ⲡϫⲓⲛⲥⲟⲛ̄ⲥ̄. ⲙ̄ⲙⲁϫⲉ ⲥⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲉⲛⲉⲣⲃⲛⲩⲉ ⲉⲧⲟ ⲛ̄ⲱⲗⲟⲩ. ⲕⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛ̄ⲣⲉⲫϫⲏⲣ. ⲕⲡⲛⲧ ⲉⲣⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲛ̄ⲣⲉⲫⲕⲁⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩ. ⲕⲃⲛⲕ ⲱⲁ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉⲫⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ. ⲕⲥⲁⲁⲛⲱ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲫⲁⲣⲙⲁⲕⲟⲥ. ⲕⲟ ⲛ̄ⲱⲃⲏⲣ ⲉⲛ̄ⲣⲉⲫϫⲓⲟⲩⲁ.[9] ⲕⲧⲏⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉⲫⲧⲣⲉ. ⲧⲟⲟⲧⲕ̄ ⲥⲙⲟⲛ̄ⲧ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉⲫⲧⲱⲣⲡ̄. ⲡϫⲟⲓ ⲧⲏⲣⲫ̄ ⲟⲧⲛ̄ ⲣⲁ ⲡⲁⲩⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲕⲁⲕⲓⲁ. ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉϫⲁⲕ ϫⲉ ⲧ̄ⲡⲛⲏⲥⲧⲉⲓⲁ. ⲧⲱⲗⲏⲗ. ⲙⲏ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲛⲓⲡⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁ ⲡⲉⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲱⲁ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϫⲉ ⲡⲏⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲱⲗⲏⲗ ⲛ̄ⲧⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲁⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲥⲡⲏⲗⲁⲓⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲟⲡⲉ.

---

[7] These words and lacunae represent three and a half lines at the top of the leaf. Legible words are represented, but clearly there is insufficient from which to gather any coherent sense.

[8] Five lines following are largely erased and illegible.

[9] ⲉⲛ̄ⲣⲉⲫϫⲓⲟⲩⲁ. T: ⲉⲛ̄ⲣⲉⲫϫⲓⲟⲩⲉ.

APPENDIX 2: HOMILETIC MATERIAL FROM GIOV.AJ INCLUDED BY REVILLOUT AND ROSSI IN THE *GNOMAI*[10]

[11]Keep your eyes from looking upon vanities. Keep your tongues from cursing (καταλαλία). Keep your ears from hearing vanities. Keep your mouth from shameful and fearful oaths. Each of you should lay up mercy to his neighbour, each of you should strive (σπουδάζειν) to keep the commandments (ἐντολή), to find the way to come to the house of God for prayer. For (γάρ) if you enter the house of God wearing the colours of the devil (διάβολος), how are you to keep the commandments (ἐντολή) of God? How can you pray in the house of God or (ἤ) fast (νηστεύειν) as your heart is not upright, nor (οὔτε) are your hands clean? Wearing these colours you will never be able to bear the commandments (ἐντολή) which are the public (treasury) (δημόσιον) of the church (ἐκκλησία). "I fast (νηστεία)" you say. You labour in vain. Your body (σῶμα) is full of lust (πορνεία), your heart full of impurity, your soul (ψυχή)…[12] The tongue full of cursing (καταλαλία), the hands full of blood, the feet pursuing evil (κακία), the mouth exulting in violence, the ears listening out for anything disgusting. You are a friend of clowns, you direct your feet to fortune-tellers, you go to those who make incantations, you feed those who make philtres (φαρμακός), you keep company with blasphemers, you mix with gluttons, your hand is one with robbers. The ship is filled with a cargo of all kinds of evil (κακία), and you say "I fast (νηστεία), I pray." Is it not on account of all these evils that the prophet (προφήτης) cries out: "You have made the house of prayer a cave (σπήλειον) of thieves"?[13]

---

[10] As noted in the introduction, this material, compassing two sheets of the codex, was included as part of the *Gnomai* by Revillout; its place within the *Gnomai* is, however, uncertain.

[11] Three and a half lines precede which have been largely erased and are illegible. A few words may be made out, ("fasting", and in the following line "those who are in darkness") but nothing from which coherent sense may emerge.

[12] Five illegible lines follow.

[13] Jer. 7:11.

ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ⲟⲛ ϫⲉ ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲁⲛⲡⲣⲁ̄ ⲛⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲥⲓϫ ⲉⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲣⲟⲓ ϯⲛⲁⲕⲧⲉ ⲛⲁⲃⲁⲗ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙ̄ⲙⲱⲧⲛ̄. ⲛⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲥⲓϫ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲙⲉⲣ ⲥⲛⲟϥ. ϥⲥⲏⲣ ⲟⲛ ϫⲉ ⲛⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲛⲏⲥⲧⲉⲓⲁ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲥϥ ⲧⲁϪⲩⲭⲏ ⲙⲟⲥⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ. ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲥⲓ ⲓⲉⲣⲏⲙⲓⲁⲥ ⲡⲉⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏⲧⲏⲥ ϫⲉ ⲙⲏ ⲟⲩⲃⲏⲃ ⲛ̄ⲣⲟⲓⲧⲉ ⲧⲉ ⲧⲁⲕⲗⲏⲣⲟⲛⲟⲙⲓⲁ ⲡⲁⲓ. [ ][14] ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲣⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲡⲉⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏⲧⲏⲥ ϫⲉ ⲁⲓϫⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩ [ ][15] ⲣⲛ̄ ⲧⲙⲏⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲗⲓⲥ. ⲁⲓⲣⲱⲕⲣ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲛⲣⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲏⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲡⲗⲁⲧⲉⲓⲁ. ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲕⲧⲉ ⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̄ ⲉⲣⲟⲓ ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ. ⲁⲓⲣⲱⲣⲧ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲱⲏⲣⲉⲕⲟⲩⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲛ ⲛⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲣⲣ̄ⲱⲓⲣⲉ ⲣⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲩ ⲉⲩⲟⲱ. ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲕⲧⲉ ⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̄ ⲉⲣⲟⲓ ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲡⲏϫⲟⲓⲥ. ⲁⲓϫⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲱⲥⲉ ⲉϫⲙ̄ ⲡⲕⲁⲣⲡⲟⲥ ⲧⲏⲣⲟ̄ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̄ ⲕⲁⲣ. ⲁⲩⲱ ⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲕⲧⲉ ⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̄ ⲉⲣⲟⲓ ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲡϫⲟⲓⲥ. ⲁⲓⲧⲁⲕⲉ ⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̄ ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲓⲧⲁⲕⲉ ⲥⲟⲇⲟⲙⲁ ⲙ̄ⲛ ⲅⲟⲙⲟⲣⲣⲁ. ⲁⲩⲱ ⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲟⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲕⲧⲉ ⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̄ ⲉⲣⲟⲓ ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲡⲏϫⲟⲓⲥ. ⲛⲁⲓ ⲥⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲙⲏ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉ ⲣⲓϫⲱⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲱⲁ ⲡⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲧⲉ ϫⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲛ̄ ⲁⲓⲥⲑⲁⲛⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲑⲏⲧ ⲉⲧⲟⲩ [ ][16]

[14] The next three lines are largely effaced.

[15] Here is an erasure, apparently of a single word.

[16] One line is erased, and the following two are legible only in part.

He also says: "If you stretch out your hands towards me I shall turn my eyes away, for your hands are full of blood."[17] It is also written: "My soul (ψυχή) hates your fasting and abstinence." Jeremiah the prophet (προφήτης) also said: "Is a hyena's nest my inheritance (κληρονομία)?"[18] [19] [20]For (γάρ) (he says) to us through the prophets (προφήτης) "I have sent in the midst of your city (πόλις), I have burnt your household goods[21] in the midst of your square (πλατεῖα), and you have not turned yourselves to me, says the Lord. I have struck your children and your youth with a violent death, and you have not turned yourselves to me, says the Lord. I have sent disease on all the fruit (καρπός) in your land, and still you have not turned yourself to me, says the Lord. I have destroyed you as (κατά) I destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, and still you have not turned to me, says the Lord."[22] Are all these things not very much upon us today, yet (δέ) you take no notice (αἰσθάνεσθαι), like somebody who is foolish…[23]

[17] Isaiah 1:15.

[18] Jer. 12:8.

[19] Orlandi, "Turin Coptic papyri", 521, suggests that the fragment regarding prayer and fasting found below should be inserted here.

[20] The previous three lines are largely effaced.

[21] The translation follows the suggestion of Rossi that the word here *sanhou* is a corrupt form of *sanhoun*. Lammeyer rather desperately translates as "monastic rule", whereas Revillout leaves the word untranslated.

[22] Cf. Amos 4:11.

[23] Several lines are missing.

ϣⲁⲩϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲉⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲛⲉ [φιλοσοφος][24] ⲛ̄ⲁⲣⲭⲁⲓⲟⲓⲥ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲑⲟⲓⲧⲉ ϫⲉ ⲟⲩⲟⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲉⲩⲥⲟⲟⲩ ⲉϣⲁⲩⲡⲱⲱⲛⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲩⲫⲩⲥⲓⲕⲟⲛ ⲉⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲥⲛ̄ⲧⲉ. ϣⲁⲩⲣ̄ ⲟⲩⲕⲁⲓⲣⲟⲥ ⲉⲩⲟ ⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲧ ⲛ̄ⲩⲣ̄ ⲟⲩⲕⲁⲓⲣⲟⲥ ⲉⲩⲟ ⲛ̄ⲥⲓⲙⲉ. ⲁⲛⲟⲛ ⲥⲱⲱⲛ ⲱ ⲛⲉⲥⲛⲏⲩ ⲉⲛϣⲁⲛⲡⲱⲱⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲛⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲑⲟⲓⲧⲉ. ⲥⲉⲛⲥⲟⲡ ⲙⲉⲛ ⲉⲛⲡⲱⲧ ⲉⲣⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ ⲉⲛⲡⲱⲣⲣ̄ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲛⲥⲓⲝ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲛϣⲗⲏⲗ ⲏ ⲉⲛⲛⲏⲥⲧⲉⲩⲉ. ⲥⲉⲛⲥⲟⲡ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲉⲛⲁⲍⲓⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲛ̄ⲣⲉⲩⲕⲁⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲙ̄ⲫⲁⲣⲛⲁⲕⲟⲥ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲛⲣⲉⲩⲡⲁⲣⲣⲉ ϫⲉ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁϣⲧⲉ. ⲛⲁϣ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉ ⲱ ⲙⲁⲙⲉⲣⲁⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛⲁⳋⲱϣⲧ̄ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ ⲛⲧ̄ⲛ̄ ⲟⲣⲅⲏ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲣⲣⲁⲓ ⲉϫⲱⲛ. ⲛⲁϣ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉ ⲩⲛⲁⳋⲱϣⲧ ⲉϫⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲛⲛⲏⲥⲧⲉⲓⲁ ⲙ̄ⲙ ⲛⲉⲛϣⲗⲏⲗ. ⲙⲏ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ϯⲉ [ ][25] ⲛⲣ̄ⲣⲱ. ⲁⲛ ⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲱϣ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ ⲣⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲓⲉⲣⲉⲙⲙⲁⲓⲥ ⲡⲉⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏⲧⲏⲥ ϫⲉ ⲙⲏ ⲉⲣⲣⲁⲓ ⲉϫⲛ̄ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛ̄ϯⲛⲁⳋⲙ̄ⲡϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ. ⲏ ⲉϫⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲣⲉⲑⲛⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲓⲙⲓⲛⲉ ⲧⲁⲯⲩⲭⲏ ⲛⲁⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲕⲃⲁ. ⲁϣ ⳋⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲉⲕⲃⲁ ⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛⲁⲛ̄ⲧ̄ⲕ̄ ⲉⲣⲣⲁⲓ ⲉϫⲱⲛ ⲛ̄ⲣⲟⲩⲟ ⲉⲧⲉⲛ ⲙⲉⲧⲁⲛⲟⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ...

[24] φιλοσοφος conj. Oscar von Lemm, "Zum koptischen Physiologus 2" in *Koptische Miszellen* 84 (St Petersburg: Bulletin de l'Académie impériale des sciences de St.-Pétersbourg, 1910), 1097–1098.

[25] A few letters are illegible here.

They would say in times of old (ἀρχαῖος)[26] of the hyena that it was an impure animal (θηρίον), in that it would change its nature (φυσικόν) into another nature (φύσις). At one time (καιρός) it would be male, at another time (καιρός) female. We too, brothers, are changeable in our nature (φύσις) like the hyena.[27] At times (μέν) we go running to the church (ἐκκλησία), we extend our hands in our prayer and our fasting (νηστεία). At times, then (δέ) we again give credence (ἀξιοῦν) to fortune-tellers, to those who make philtres (φαρμακός) and to sorcerers saying "Be our protection." Beloved, how is God not angered with us, how nor pour out his wrath (ὀργή) upon us? How can he look upon our fasting and our prayer? Is it not on account of such wicked deeds that God cries out to us through the prophet (προφήτης) Jeremiah: "It is on this account that I do not visit you, says the Lord. Why does my soul (ψυχή) not take revenge on a people (ἔθνος) like this?"[28] What indeed is the vengeance that God will take upon us unless we repent (μετανοεῖν)…

---

[26] It is also possible, given the corruption, that there was a subject, such as "people", and that the adjective "ancient" stood in apposition to this missing subject. Oscar von Lemm, "Zum koptischen Physiologus 2" in *Koptische Miszellen* 84 (St Petersburg: Bulletin de l'Académie impériale des sciences de St.-Pétersbourg, 1910), 1097–1098 suggests "philosophers."

[27] On the hyena Cf. the *Physiologos*, a parallel observed by von Lemm, "Zum koptischen Physiologus 2" The *Physiologus* text reads thus: ὁ νόμος λέγει: Μὴ φάγῃς ὕαιναν μηδὲ ὅμοιον αὐτῇ. ὁ φυσιολόγος ἔλεξε περί ταύτης: ὅτι ἀρρενόθηλυ ἐστί, ποτὲ μὲν ἄρρεν, ποτὲ δὲ θῆλυ: μεμιασμένον θηρίον ἐστί, διὰ τὸ ἀλλάσσειν αὐτοῦ τὴν φύσιν, διά τοῦτο καὶ ὁ Ἱερεμίας λέγει: Μὴ σπήλαιον ὑαίνης ἡ κληρονομία μου ἐμοι. On the use of the *Physiologos* more generally in Coptic literature note A. van Lantschoot, "A propos du Physiologus." in *Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Ewing Crum* (Bulletin of the Byzantine Institute 2; Boston: The Byzantine Institute, 1950), 339–63.

[28] Jer. 5:9, 29.

APPENDIX 3: OTHER FRAGMENTARY MATERIAL FROM GIOV.AJ

a. A fragment regarding prayer and fasting (Rossi fragment 4)

ⲧⲛⲏⲥⲧⲉⲓⲁ ⲙ̄ⲛ [ ] ⲧⲁⲗⲥⲟ ⲛⲛⲉⲩ [ ] ⲉⲩⲟⲩ ⲱ [ ] ⲡⲉⲫⲗⲏⲗ ⲧ [ ] ⲙ̄ⲡⲡⲁⲛⲧⲟⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ [ ]

ⲧⲛⲩⲥⲧⲉⲓⲁ ⲙ̄ⲛⲡⲉⲫⲗⲏⲗ ⲭⲣⲏⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲙⲟⲧⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲩ. ⲱ ⲧⲛⲏⲥⲧⲉⲓⲁ ⲙ̄ⲛⲡⲉⲫⲗⲏⲗ ⲧⲥⲁⲗⲡⲓⲅ̈ ⲉⲧⲉⲫⲁⲥⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲡⲉⲧⲙⲟⲟⲩⲧ ⲧⲱⲟⲩⲛ. ⲱ ⲧⲛⲏⲥⲧⲉⲓⲁ ⲙ̄ⲛⲡⲉⲫⲗⲏⲗ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉⲩⲇⲓⲱⲕⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁ ⲛⲉⲡⲛ̄ⲁ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲛⲏⲣⲟⲛ ⲣⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲡⲁⲣⲣⲏⲥⲓⲁ. ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣ ⲧⲥⲁⲃⲟ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲛ ⲣⲛ̄ ⲧ̄ⲕ̄ⲥⲃⲱ ⲣⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲩⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲓⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁ ⲛⲉⲩⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲭⲛⲟⲩⲩ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲇⲁⲓⲙⲟⲛⲓⲟⲛ ⲭⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲟⲩⲁⲛⲟⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲉⲫⲅⲙ̄ⲅⲟⲙ ⲉⲛⲟⲭⲟ̄ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ. ⲁⲩⲟⲩⲱⲫⲃ̄ ⲛⲥⲓ ⲡⲥⲁⲣ ⲙ̄ⲙⲉ ⲉⲩⲧⲥⲁⲫⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲩⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲭⲉ ⲁⲫⲛ̄ [ ] ⲉⲫⲁⲩⲇⲓⲱⲕⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁ ⲡⲣⲉⲩⲫⲁⲁⲣ ⲡⲉⲭⲁⲩ ⲭⲉ ⲡⲉⲓⲅⲉⲛⲟⲥ ⲙⲉⲩⲉⲫⲛⲟⲭⲟ̄ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲓⲙⲏⲧⲓ ⲣⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲫⲗⲏⲗ ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ⲧⲛⲏⲥⲧⲓⲁ. ⲧⲛⲏⲥⲧⲉⲓⲁ ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ⲡⲉⲫⲗⲏⲗ ⲫⲁⲩⲃⲟⲛⲑⲉⲓ ⲉⲛⲉⲧⲣⲛ̄ ⲙ̄ⲙⲉⲧⲁⲗ[ⲥⲟ][29] ⲟⲩⲭⲁⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟ[ ] ⲙ̄ⲡⲉ$\overline{\text{ⲭⲥ}}$. ⲡⲁⲓ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲛⲛⲉⲭ ⲡⲉⲛⲣⲟⲟⲩⲱ ⲧⲏⲣ$\bar{\text{ⲩ}}$ ⲉⲣⲟⲩ.

[29] Five lines follow in which, whereas some letters may be read, no sense is to be obtained.

APPENDIX 3: OTHER FRAGMENTARY MATERIAL FROM GIOV.AJ[30]

a. A fragment regarding fasting and prayer (Rossi, fragment 4)

Fasting (νηστεία) … healing … prayer … Almighty (παντοκράτωρ)… Fasting (νηστεία) and prayer the treasure (χρῆμα) … whoever rests in it. O fasting (νηστεία) and prayer, trumpet (σάλπιγξ) which summons the dead to rise. O fasting (νηστεία) and prayer which puts to flight (διώκειν) every evil (πονηρός) spirit (πνεῦμα) with boldness (παρρησία), just as the Saviour (σωτήρ) taught in his teaching in the Gospel (εὐαγγέλιον) as his disciples (μαθητής) asked him concerning the demon (δαιμόνιον), when they could not cast it out. He answered them and taught his disciples (μαθητής) how it is that such a demon might be put to flight (διώκειν) as he said to them: "This type (γένος) cannot be cast out except (εἰμήτι) by prayer and fasting (νηστεία)."[31]

Fasting (νηστεία) and prayer come to the support (βοήθεια)…healing (?) salvation of Christ. Those whose entire concern is with it rest themselves therein.

[30] As noted in the introduction, Orlandi suggests that this material is part of the *Gnomai*. See further in the introduction ad loc.

[31] Mark 9:28–29.

ⲛⲧⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲇⲉ ⲱ ⲡⲁⲫⲏⲣⲉ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ. ⲣⲁⲑⲏ ⲛ̄ⲣⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ϯⲣⲱⲛ ⲉⲧⲟⲧⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̄ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲡⲱⲧ ⲉⲣⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲡⲉⲫⲗⲏⲗ ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲡⲓⲥⲧⲓⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲛⲛⲥⲧⲉⲓⲁ ⲛⲉⲓⲣⲉⲩⲣⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ ⲣⲙ̄ⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲛⲃⲱⲕ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ. ⲁⲡⲉⲫⲗⲏⲗ ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲛⲛⲥⲧⲉⲓⲁ ⲣ̄ⲟⲩⲉⲓⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ ⲣⲙ̄ ⲧⲙⲛⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲕⲁⲕⲉ. ⲁⲧⲛⲛⲥⲧⲉⲓⲁ ⲟⲩⲱⲛ ⲛ̄ⲛ̄ⲣⲟ ⲙⲡⲉⲫⲧⲉⲕⲟ ⲁⲥⲛ̄ⲧⲛ̄ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲭ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲛⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲇⲏⲙⲟⲥ ⲧⲏⲣ̄ⲩ. ⲱ ⲡⲉⲫⲗⲏⲗ ⲙⲛ̄ⲛⲛⲥⲧⲉⲓⲁ ⲡⲣⲟⲡⲗⲟⲛ ⲉⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲧⲙⲟⲧⲛ̄ ⲙ̄ⲙⲓⲫⲉ ⲙ̄ [ ] ⲣⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲡⲉⲭⲣⲉⲓⲥⲧⲓⲁⲛⲟⲥ. ⲱ ⲡⲉⲫⲗⲏⲗ ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲛⲛⲥⲧⲉⲓⲁ ⲛ̄ⲣⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉⲩⲛⲟⲩⲣⲙ̄ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲏⲡ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ. ⲱ ⲡⲉⲫⲗⲏⲗ ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲛⲛⲥⲧⲉⲓⲁ ⲡⲣⲉⲛⲟⲩⲫⲉ ⲛ̄ⲉⲧⲣⲙ̄ ⲡⲣⲉⲃⲱⲱⲛ. ⲱ ⲧⲛⲛⲥⲧⲉⲓⲁ ⲙⲛ̄ⲡⲉⲫⲗⲏⲗ ⲛⲉⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩⲣ̄ⲣⲃⲥⲱ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲕⲛⲕⲁⲣⲏⲩ ⲣⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲛⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡϫⲁⲩ. ⲱ ⲧⲛⲛⲥⲧⲉⲓⲁ [ ]

b. A fragment regarding sorcerers (Rossi fragment 5)

ⲙⲓϫⲁⲛⲗ ⲣ̄ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲃ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲡⲇⲓⲁⲃⲟⲗⲟⲥ. ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲛⲟⲛ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲛ̄ⲕⲉⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲫⲁⲣⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲡⲟⲟⲣ ⲙⲛ̄ⲛ̄ⲥⲓⲟⲩ ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲥⲧⲣⲁⲧⲉⲓⲁ ⲧⲏⲣ̄ⲥ̄. ⲥⲉⲟ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲃ̄ⲗⲗⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲓ ⲡⲉⲡⲗⲁⲛⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲉⲧⲭ̄ⲙⲟⲩⲟⲩⲧ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲥⲓ ⲡⲥⲁⲧⲁⲛⲁⲥ. ⲫⲁⲩⲭⲓⲣⲣⲃ̄ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲣⲱⲥ ⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲫⲁⲛⲧⲭ̄ⲉϫⲁⲛⲧⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲏⲧ ⲛ̄ⲛⲓⲃⲁⲗⲣⲏⲧ. ⲡⲉⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲩⲣⲏⲧ ⲉⲭⲟ ⲛ̄ⲱⲛⲉ.

ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲟⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲧⲟⲗⲙⲁ ⲛⲭ̄ⲏ ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲙ̄ⲛⲡⲉⲥⲛⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉ$\overline{\text{ⲭⲥ}}$ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲙⲁⲅⲟⲥ ⲉⲩⲣ̄ⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲉⲩⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲱⲛ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲇⲁⲥ. ⲡⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩⲣ̄ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁⲩⲁⲁⲩ ⲁⲩⲡⲁⲣⲁⲇⲓⲇⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲛⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲡⲉ$\overline{\text{ⲭⲥ}}$ ⲉⲧⲥⲓⲝ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉⲩⲣ̄ⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲥⲟⲡ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲉⲩⲉⲓⲙⲉ ⲉⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁⲩⲁⲁⲩ ⲁⲩⲕⲣⲓⲙⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲩ ϫⲉ ⲛ̄ⲩⲙ̄ⲡⲱⲛ̄ⲣ ⲁⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲱⲛ̄ⲣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲩⲟⲥⲓⲩ ⲁⲩⲙⲟⲩ. ⲡⲁⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲣⲟⲩⲟ ⲉⲛ̄ⲇⲁⲓⲙⲱⲛ. ⲉⲩⲣⲉⲩϫⲓ ⲣ̄ⲙ̄ ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲭ̄ⲥ̄.

You, my sanctified children, above all else resort in everything to prayer with faith (πίστις) and fasting (νηστεία) to guard us in every place where we might go. Fasting (νηστεία) and prayer have given light in the midst of darkness, fasting (νηστεία) has opened the doors of a prison and led us to salvation in the midst of all peoples (δῆμος). O prayer with fasting (νηστεία), the armour (ὅπλον) of those who join battle … by the Christian (χριστιανός). O fasting (νηστεία) with prayer, bringing salvation to those who are counted within them. O fasting (νηστεία), O prayer, the plenty of those who are in the midst of straitened times. O fasting with prayer, these give covering to those who are naked in the midst of the frost. O fasting (νηστεία) …

b. A fragment regarding sorcerers (Rossi fragment 5)[32]

…Michael (?overcame)[33] the work of the devil (διάβολος); not only he, (οὐ μόνον), but (ἀλλά) all the other angels (ἄγγελος) as far above as the moon and the stars, and the whole host (στρατεία). For they are blind, that is imposters (πλάνος), just like him who kills, that is Satan. They are wont to dress themselves as angels (ἄγγελος) of light until they ?exercise authority in the hearts of the simple, those who do not have …

On this account, whoever dares (τολμᾶν) approach the Body (σῶμα) and Blood of Christ and a sorcerer (μάγος) commits sin after the pattern of Judas. For anyone who acts in this manner betrays (παραδιδόναι) Christ Our Lord into the hands of those who are sinful one time, and when he knows what he has done he has considered (κρινεῖν) himself unworthy of life, and has resigned himself to death. They (δέ) are more evil than the demons (δαίμων), betraying the body (σῶμα) of Christ.

---

[32] The attitude of this fragment tends to support the suggestion made by Walter M. Shandruk, "Christian Use of Magic in Late Antique Egypt" *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 20 (2012), 31–57, on an onomastic basis, that Christians in the fourth century would resort to non-Christian sorcery whereas in the fifth century on these magical practices were themselves Christianized.

[33] The verb is in lacuna.

ⲛ̄ⲇⲁⲓⲙⲟⲛⲓⲟⲛ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲁⲩⲥ[ ] ⲡⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣ ⲁⲩⲱⲱ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ[ ] ⲕⲡⲉ ⲡⲉⲭ̅ⲥ̅ ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲉϥⲉ ⲡⲓⲧⲓⲙⲁ ⲛⲁϥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲁⲛ [ ] ⲅⲉ ⲛⲁϥ. ⲡⲙⲁⲅⲟⲥ ⲇⲉ ⲁϥⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛϥ ⲁϥⲭⲓⲱϫⲕⲁⲕ ⲉⲣⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲩⲇⲁⲓⲙⲟⲛⲓⲟⲛ ϫⲉ ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ ⲉⲣⲟⲓ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲧⲉ ⲁⲛ. ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ϫⲁϥⲃⲟⲟⲗⲉϥ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲣⲃⲥⲱ ⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲟ [ ] ⲛ̄ϥⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲓⲃⲁⲗϩⲏⲧ ϫⲁⲛⲧⲟⲩⲣ̄ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲧⲉ. ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ϥⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ϩⲟⲩⲟ ϫⲉ ⲛ̄ϥⲙⲡϫⲁ ⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ⲃⲱⲕ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲡⲱⲛ̄ϩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲧⲃⲏⲕ ⲛ̄ϥⲕⲱ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲛ ⲥⲙⲟⲧⲙ̄ ⲟⲉ ⲉϫⲁϫⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲣⲉϥϫⲙ̄ϫⲉ ⲉⲓⲇⲱⲗⲟⲛ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲉϫⲁϫⲉ ⲙ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲙⲁⲅⲟⲥ. ⲡⲁⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉϥϫⲁⲛⲙ̄ⲡϫⲁ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲇⲱⲣⲉⲁ ⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ [ ]

ⲡⲣⲟⲙⲡⲉ ⲣⲱϫⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲡⲉϥⲟⲩϫⲁⲓ. ⲡⲙⲁⲅⲟⲥ ⲇⲉ ⲕⲁⲛ ⲉϥϫⲁⲛⲕⲧⲟϥ ⲙⲟⲅⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ⲅⲧⲁⲛϩⲟⲩⲧ̄ϥ ⲉⲡⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ϩⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲉϩⲙⲁⲁⲃ ⲛ̄ⲣⲟⲙⲡⲉ. ⲟⲩⲉⲓⲟⲡⲉ ⲉⲩⲙⲟⲥⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ ϩⲓⲧⲙ̄ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲕⲟⲓⲛⲱⲛⲉⲓ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ. ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲧ ⲉⲃⲟⲗϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲉⲓⲙ[ⲛⲧⲓ] ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲙ̄ⲛⲧⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ. ⲧⲙ̄ⲛⲧⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲟⲩⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲥ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲕⲱ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ. ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲇⲉ ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ϫⲁⲩϫⲓⲕⲃⲁ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ. ⲧⲙ[ ]

c. A fragment regarding worshippers of Michael (unpublished)

ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲧⲟⲥⲩ ⲛⲁϥ ϩⲱⲥ ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ϩⲱⲥ ⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏⲧⲏⲥ [ⲟ]ⲩⲧ[ⲉ] ⲟⲛ ⲛⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲃⲱϩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲧⲁⲕⲟ [...]ⲉⲩ ⲧⲉⲩⲧⲉⲭⲛⲏ.

The Saviour (σωτήρ) was identified by the demons (δαιμόνιον) as the Christ, the holy one of God,[34] and they were reprimanded on this account … The sorcerer (μάγος) knows the demon (δαιμόνιον), and calls out to him "Obey me." Not only this, but he clothes himself in a garment to persuade (πείθειν) the simple to perform abominations. On this account they are evil in the extreme and unworthy of entering into life, as is anyone who visits them, or who is like them. So it is better to speak with a worshipper of idols (εἴδωλον) than with a sorcerer (μάγος). If somebody is worthy of a gift (δωρεά)… a year is sufficient for his salvation. The sorcerer (μάγος), even if (κἄν) he repent, scarcely (μόγις) may he approach the mysteries (μυστήριον) for thirty years.[35]

It is a craft which is hated by God, as is anyone who is involved with it (κοινωνεῖν) and anyone who gives them of the mystery (μυστήριον), except (εἰμήτι) in ignorance, for ignorance is forgivable. Whoever (δέ) is knowledgeable takes vengeance on it.

c. A fragment regarding worshippers of Michael (unpublished)[36]

They have not attached themselves to him as God nor as prophet (προφήτης) nor have they touched? destruction … in the acquisition of their craft (τέχνη)

---

[34] Mark 1:24.

[35] We may here observe that the 34th and 35th *Canones Basilii* are concerned with Christian resort to sorcery, and note that the same thirty year excommunication for sorcerers is found there, as here.

[36] Although material does not on the face of it belong among the *Gnomai*, the verso contains a page number, 80, which would place this material within the pagination of the *Gnomai*. See the introduction, in which it is suggested that the scribe of T was working from a confused copy. It is also possible that this fragment is related to fragment b (Rossi, 5) above, given the common theme of Michael. In this case those who are praying to Michael are the sorcerers, and these two sheets would thus constitute the two missing sheets, this one being the first of the two. This does not, however, mean that they were part of the original *Gnomai*.

ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲉⲩ[ⲱⲟⲩ]ⲱⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲭⲉ ⲁⲛⲟⲛ [ⲛⲉⲭⲣⲉ]ⲓⲥⲧⲓⲁⲛⲟⲥ ⲉⲣⲟⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲁⲛⲛ[.] ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲣⲉⲛⲧⲓⲭⲣⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲛ̣ⲉⲥⲉ ⲭⲱⲱⲙⲟⲥ ⲣⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲩⲧⲉⲭⲛⲏ ⲭⲉ ⲉⲛⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓⲙ̄ ⲙⲓⲭⲁⲏⲗ. ⲡⲁⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ. ⲉⲩⲧⲱⲣⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲧⲣⲟⲗⲟⲃⲙⲛ̄ ⲡⲉ. ⲧⲥⲁⲱⲉ ⲉⲩⲟⲩⲱⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲩⲧⲁⲡⲣⲟ ⲉⲣⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲡⲉ ⲉⲩⲭⲓⲟⲩⲁⲉ ⲡⲁⲣⲭⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ. ⲉⲱⲭⲉ ⲱⲁⲭⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲉⲣⲟⲡⲣⲱⲙⲓⲉⲛⲁ ⲭ[ⲉ].ⲩ ⲭⲛⲁ† ⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ ⲣⲁⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲣⲙ̄ⲡ̣ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧ̣ⲉⲕⲣⲓⲥⲓⲥ.

ⲉⲓⲉⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲁⲣⲭⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ[37] ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲕ ⲛⲁ[..] ⲉⲩⲉⲱⲱⲙ̄ⲧⲟ̣[..]ⲛ̣ⲉ̣[..] ⲡⲉⲧⲣⲉⲣⲉⲛⲉ [.....] [ⲡⲉⲧ]ⲱⲟⲩⲉⲓⲧ ⲱⲱ[.]ⲉⲛⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲧⲉⲟⲩ[.] ⲡⲣⲟⲉⲡ ⲉⲭⲁⲭⲉ ⲙ̄ⲛ[.....]ⲟ̣ⲩⲧ̣ ⲡⲭ[ⲁ]ⲭⲉ [.]ⲩⲱⲛⲱ[.]ⲣⲑⲉⲣⲉ [ⲙⲓ]ⲓⲭⲁ̣ⲏⲗ [.]ⲙ̄ⲡ̣ⲉⲉ[...]ⲛⲟⲩⲣ[..]ⲣ[.....]ⲛ[....]ⲛⲉⲧ[.]ⲟⲡⲟ [.....]ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ̄(80)ⲧⲟⲕ ⲡⲉⲡⲁⲣⲭⲓⲥⲧⲣⲁⲧⲏⲅ[ⲟⲥ] ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲙ̄ⲧⲭⲣⲉⲓⲥⲧⲓⲁⲛⲟ[ⲥ] ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲩⲣ̄ⲉⲕⲣ̄ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁ[...]ⲛⲟⲩⲕ ⲡⲉ. ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲛⲓⲭⲱⲱ̣ⲙⲟⲥ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲥⲭⲉ ⲁ̣ⲩⲧⲁⲣⲕ̣ⲟⲕ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲙ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲡ̣ⲉ̣[ⲧ]ⲛⲁⲧⲁⲣⲕⲟⲕ ⲭⲉ ⲣⲉ[ⲟ]ⲃ ⲡⲉⲕⲱⲛⲣⲉ. ⲙ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲕ̄ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙ̄ⲭⲟⲩⲧⲙ̄ ⲛⲕ̄ⲙⲟⲩ ⲡⲟⲥⲱ ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲡⲉⲧⲭ̣ⲟⲥⲉ ⲉⲭⲙ̄ ⲧⲙⲙ̄ⲧⲣⲱⲙⲉ. ⲉⲱⲭⲉ ⲙ̄ⲧⲁ̣ ⲁ̣ⲁⲛⲓⲏⲗ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲧⲉ ⲉⲑⲟⲣⲁⲥⲓⲥ ⲙ̄ⲅⲁⲃⲣⲓⲏⲗ[.]ⲁⲩⲣⲉ ⲁⲩⲣ̄ⲡⲱ̄ⲙⲟⲩ. ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ̄ⲧⲟⲩ ⲡⲉⲧⲣ̄ⲙⲙ̄ⲧⲣⲉ ⲭⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲛⲓⲩⲉ ⲱⲱⲭⲡ̄ ⲣⲣⲁⲓ ⲙ̄ⲣⲛⲧ. ⲙⲁⲗⲓⲥⲧⲁ ⲉⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲉⲩ̣ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ. ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲡⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ †ⲥⲟⲙ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲙ̄ⲱⲟⲙⲙ̄ⲧ ⲙ̄ⲥⲟⲡ. ⲉⲁⲭⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲧⲉⲩⲃⲓⲭ ⲁⲩⲧⲟⲩⲛⲟⲥⲟ̄ⲩ ⲙ̄ⲥⲟⲡ ⲥⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲟⲩⲓⲥ ⲁⲩⲃ̄ⲃⲟⲙ ⲁ̣ⲩⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ ⲉⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲩⲱⲁⲭⲉ ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲙⲓⲭⲁⲏⲗ ⲡⲁⲣⲭ̣[ⲓ]ⲥⲧⲣⲁⲧⲏⲅⲟⲥ. ⲟⲩⲛ ⲟ̣ⲟ̣ⲙ̣ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉ[ⲣ]ⲟ[ⲩ]. ⲛ̄ⲉ̣ⲣⲉ ⲟⲩⲁⲧⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲡⲉ [ⲁⲩ]ⲧⲣⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲣ̄ⲉⲓⲣ[ⲏⲏⲓ ⲙ̄ⲛ] ⲡⲇ[ⲓ]ⲁⲃⲟⲗⲟ[ⲥ]. ⲧⲁⲓⲟ[ⲩ ⲭⲉ] ⲟⲩⲁ̣ⲧⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲉ[.....]

[37] The codex reads ⲡⲁⲣⲭⲁⲣⲭⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ.

but they boast saying "We are not Christians but anti-Christ (ἀντίχριστος)" and they say in their craft, "We pray to Michael". This is wicked in respect to every sin. They summon what is sweet and what is bitter, opening their mouth to heaven, blaspheming the archangel (ἀρχάγγελος) of God. If every word which tries to get out (?)… it would give evidence against them in the Day of Judgement (κρίσις). Were it the archangel (ἀρχάγγελος)… they would be strangers… that which is vain become as blasphemy… Michael…[38]

And he is the chief commander (ἀρχιστράτηγος) of Christianity and one who does good. But (ἀλλὰ) I should not say this, for if they have sworn on him. For (γάρ) who among humanity would swear on him, "Destroy your son!" I will throw him out head over heels and he will die. Moreover (πόσῳ μᾶλλον) what is as exalted as humanity? If Daniel alone saw the vision (ὅρασις) of Gabriel.[39] He fell and became a stranger. He it is who bears witness that no breath remained within. He was a person of especial (μάλιστα) holiness. The angel (ἄγγελος) empowered him three times, taking his hand. He raised him twice and he was hardly (μόγις) able to understand (hear?) what he said. Moreover (μᾶλλον δέ) Michael is the chief commander (ἀρχιστράτηγος). It is possible that if a human being were to see [him] he would cease to exist.[40] [He] [will?] cause[?d] God to make peace (εἰρήνη) [with] the devil (διάβολος). Honour [him since] he is without existence…

[38] A number of lines here are illegible, or do not allow sufficient sense to be made.

[39] Daniel 8:15–27.

[40] Although there is much that is obscure in this fragment, the sense seems to be that if Daniel, who was a saintly man, was rendered virtually unconscious by the presence of Gabriel, how much more would a sinful man be affected by the presence of the yet more powerful archangel Michael.

INDEX

PRIMARY LITERATURE (APART FROM THE *GNOMAI*)

Biblical References

Genesis 18:1–8 81
Ps 18:6 75
Proverbs 10:12 69, 93
Isaiah 1:15. 101
Isaiah 37:16 77
Isaiah 40:15 77
Isaiah 58:7 83
Jer. 5:9, 29 103
Jer. 7:11 99
Jer. 12:8 101
Daniel 8:15–27 111
Hosea 6:6 85
Amos 4:11 101
Matt. 5:7 85
Matt. 7:2 59
Matt. 9:13 85
Mark 1:24 109
Mark 9:28–29 105
Luke 6:36–38 85

Christian Literature

Anon.
Canones Athanasii
92 91
98 89, 91
Canones Basilii
12 92
26 21, 89, 97
27 89
34 109
35 109
36 91
Canones Hippolyti
16 12, 92
17 12
18 13
21 13, 92
26 88
27 12
32 13
Constitutiones apostolorum
6.29 88
Didache
1.2 94
2.3 94
3.2 11, 93
3.8–9 94
4.1–2 94
4.8 93
Didascalia apostolorum
1.3.8–11 89
1.3.10 12
1.8.26 88

2.57.10 88
2.59–60 88
Historia de Nativitate Mariae
9 8, 89-90
Protoevangelium Jacobi
8 90
Traditio apostolica
35/41 88
Vita Syncleticae
6 89
Vita Virginis Mariae (Sahidic)
Fragment 2 90
Athanasius
De fuga 24. 8
Ep. 1 ad virg.
12–17 8-9, 15, 89
13 92
17 90
Ps-Athanasius De virg.
11 91
12 18
Clement of Alexandria *Paed.*
2.8 20
2.10 20
3.3. 20, 89
Strom.
4.136.2 87
4.153.1–2 87
5.1 87
6.134.1–2 87
6.135.1–2 87
Cyril of Alexandria
Comm. in Joh.
(on John 11.26) 91
Egeria *Iter.*
27.7 8
29.1–3. 8
Evagrius *Sententiae* 4 18
23 91
24 91
26 92
39 88
54 88
Justin *Dial.*
88.5 87
102.4 87
141.1 87
John Chrysostom
De virginitate
61–63 89
Fem. reg.
1 89
7 89
Hom. in 1 Tim.
8 89, 91
9 88, 92
Origen, De Oratione 32 90
Hom. in Lev. 9.10 90
Princ. 3.1 87
Rufinus *Sexti*
Sententiae praef. 22–3
Socrates *Historia*
ecclesiastica 5.22 93

Classical Literature

Papyri:
P.Bour 1 22
PSI 6.698 18
P.Oxy 44.3205 18
P.Oxy 66.3862 18
P.Lond. 5.1731 18
Anon. *Physiologus* 24 103
ps-Diogenianus
Proverbia praef. 23
Galen *De Propriorum Animi*
Cuiuslibet Affectuum
Dignotione et
Curatione 6 22

Hermogenes *Progymnasmata*
4 13–14
Plutarch *Coniugalia praecepta*
145b–146 23
Seneca *Ep.* 2.5–6, 23
Soranus *Gyn.*
1.4.19–23 90

MODERN AUTHORS

Achelis, Hans 1, 8, 9, 11, 24
Adkin, Neil 8
Atkinson, Robert 3, 83
Bagnall, Roger S. 24
Batiffol, Pierre 1,
Bradshaw, Paul F. 92, 93
Brakke, David 9, 15, 19, 91
Brakmann, Heinzgard 10
Buzi, Paola 1
Coquin, René-Georges 12–13
Crum, W.E. 1, 4, 25, 91, 96–7
Davis, Stephen J. 19
Depauw, M. 24
Duval, Y.-M. 9
Elm, Susanna 19
Frede, Michael 67–8
Gijsel, J 15, 90
Haase, Felix 2, 9–11, 12
Lammeyer, Joseph 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 21, 25, 50, 89, 101
Lantschoot, A. van 103
Lazaridis, Nikolaos 22
Lemm, Oscar von 102, 103
Markschies, Christoph 12
Morgan, Teresa 14, 17, 22, 23
Mueller, Joseph G. 11
Orlandi, Tito 2, 3, 6, 25, 101, 105
Revillout, Eugène 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 25, 28, 29, 31, 33, 42, 48, 52, 54, 55, 62, 66, 70, 71, 73, 74, 75, 83, 84, 85, 93, 98, 99, 101
Riedel, Wilhelm 91
Robinson, Forbes 90
Rossi, Francesco 3, 6, 25, 31, 48, 55, 67, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 79, 83,
93, 98, 99, 101
Rowlandson, Jane 18
Shandruk, Walter M. 107
Sinkewicz, Robert E. 88
Schmidt, Carl 89
Stewart, Alistair C. 1, 11
Wilken, Robert L. 23
Wilson, W.T. 14, 22
Zamfir, Korinna 92
Zoega, Georg 1, 3, 25

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Achelis, Hans, "The ΓΝΩΜΑΙ of the synod of Nicaea" *JTS* 2 (1901), 121–129

Adkin, Neil, "Ambrose *De virginibus* 2.2.10f and the *Gnomes of the council of Nicaea*" *REA* 38 (1992), 261–270

Atkinson, Robert, "On Professor Rossi's publication of south-Coptic texts" *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy (1889–1901)* 3 (1893–1896), 24–99

Bagnall, Roger S., "Religious conversion and onomastic change in early Byzantine Egypt" *BASP* 19 (1982), 105–24

Batiffol, Pierre, *Didascalia CCCXVIII patrum* (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1887)

Bradshaw, Paul F., "Receiving Communion" in *Reconstructing early Christian worship* (London: SPCK, 2009), 20–37

———, (ed.) *The Canons of Hippolytus* (Bramcote: Grove, 1987)

Brakke, David, "The Authenticity of the Ascetic Athanasius" *Orientalia* 63 (1994), 17–56

———, *Athanasius and asceticism* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998)

Brakmann, Heinzgard, "Alexandreia und die Kanones des Hippolyt" *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 22, (1979), 139–149

Buzi, Paola, *Catalogo dei manoscritti copti borgiani conservati presso la Biblioteca nazionale "Vittorio Emanuele III" di Napoli* (Rome: Scienze e lettere, 2009)

Coquin, René-Georges, *Les canons d'Hippolyte* (PO 31.2; Paris, Firmin-Didot, 1966)

Crum, W.E., *Coptic ostraca from the collections of the Egypt Exploration Fund, the Cairo Museum and others* (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1902)

Davis, Stephen J., *The cult of St Thecla: a tradition of women's piety in late antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001)

Depauw, M. and W. Clarysse, "How Christian was Fourth Century Egypt? Onomastic Perspectives on Conversion" *Vigiliae Christianae* 67 (2013), 407–435

Duval, Y.-M., "La problématique de la 'Lettre aux vierges' d'Athanase" *Le Muséon,* 88 (1975), 405–433

Elm, Susanna, 'Virgins of God'. The Making of Asceticism in Late Antiquity (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994)

Frede, Michael, *A free will: origins of the notion in ancient thought* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011)

Gijsel, J. and R. Beyers, *Libri de nativitate Mariae* (CCSA 9–10; Turnhout: Brepols, 1997)

Haase, Felix, *Die koptischen Quellen zum Konzil von Nicäa* (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums 10.4; Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1920)

Lammeyer, Joseph, *Die sogenannte Gnomen des Concils von Nicaea: ein homiletischer Traktat des 4 Jahrhunderts* (Beirut: np, 1912)

Lantschoot, A. van, "A propos du Physiologus." in *Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Ewing Crum* (Bulletin of the Byzantine Institute 2; Boston: The Byzantine Institute, 1950), 339–63

Lazaridis, Nikolaos, *Wisdom in Loose Form. The Language of Egyptian and Greek Proverbs in Collections of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods* (Leiden: Brill, 2007)

Lemm, Oscar von, "Zum koptischen Physiologus 2" in *Koptische Miszellen* 84 (St Petersburg: Bulletin de l'Académie impériale des sciences de St.-Pétersbourg, 1910), 1097–1098

Markschies, Christoph, "Wer schrieb die sogenannte *Traditio apostolica*? Neue Boebachtungen und Hypothesen zu einer kaum lösbaren Frage aus der altkirchlichen Literaturegeschichte" in Wolfram Kinzig, Christoph Markschies, Markus Vinzent (edd) *Tauffragen und Bekenntnis* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999)

Morgan, Teresa, *Literate education in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)

———, *Popular morality in the early Roman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)

Mueller, Joseph G., "The ancient church order literature: genre or tradition" *JECS* 15 (2007), 337–380

Orlandi, Tito, "Les papyrus coptes du Musée Égyptien de Turin" *Le Muséon* 87 (1974), 115–127

———, The Turin Coptic papyri" *Augustinianum* (2013), 501–530

Revillout,Eugène, *Le Concile de Nicée d'après les documents coptes: première série de documents (*Paris: Maisonneuve, 1873)

———, *Le Concile de Nicée d'après les documents coptes et les diverses collections canoniques: nouvelle série de documents* (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1876)

———, *Le Concile de Nicée d'après les documents coptes et les diverse collections canoniques* 2 (suite) (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1898)

Riedel, Wilhelm, Walter E. Crum, *The Canons of Athanasius* (repr.; Amsterdam: Philo, 1973)

Robinson, Forbes, (ed.) *Coptic apocryphal Gospels* (Texts and studies 4.2; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896)

Rossi, Francesco, *Trascizione di alcuni testi copti tratti dai papiri del Museo Egizio di Torino* 1.2 (Turin: Loescher, 1884)

Rowlandson, Jane, (ed.) *Women and society in Greek and Roman Egypt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)

Shandruk, Walter M., "Christian Use of Magic in Late Antique Egypt" *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 20 (2012), 31–57

Sinkewicz, Robert E., *Evagrius of Pontus: the Greek ascetic corpus*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006)

Schmidt, Carl, *Fragmente einer Schrift des Märtyrerbischofs Petrus von Alexandria* (TU 5.4b; Leipzig: Akademie, 1901)

Stewart, Alistair C., *On the two ways: life or death, light or darkness* (Yonkers NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2011)

Wilken, Robert L., "Wisdom and philosophy in early Christianity" in R.L. Wilken (ed.), *Aspects of wisdom in Judaism and early Christianity* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975), 143–168

Wilson, W.T., *The Mysteries of Righteousness: the Literary Composition and Genre of the Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1994)

Zamfir, Korinna, "Men and women in the house(hold) of God: Chrysostom's homilies on 1 Tim. 2, 8–15" *Sacra scripta* 6 (2008), 144–164

Zoega, Georg, *Catalogus codicum copticorum manu scriptorum qui in Museo Borgiano velitris adservantur* (Rome: Typi sacrae congregationis de propaganda fidei, 1810)